

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1887.

AVAILABLE FRENCH TEXTS V.

Mr. Carl Schoenhof, Boston, has really published only one small volume which, strictly speaking, can be classed under what we have called 'French texts.' But this is a gem in its way, George Sand's 'Marianne.' In the French editions it is printed in the volume called 'La Tour de Percement' so that it could not be procured separately. No short story by George Sand could give a truer idea of what she is at her best than 'Marianne.' It is difficult enough to be read at the end of a second year of French, or at the beginning of a third. Although Professor Jules Luquiens, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in the preface of the volume which he has edited for Mr. Schoenhof, calls it a reader, he has produced a work which deserves not to be confounded with the ordinary school readers made up of short extracts. His 'French Prose of Popular Science and Descriptive Literature' contains only eleven selections which, if two be omitted, average over thirty-five pages in length. He may then be fairly said to have presented in his thick volume of over 400 pages a collection of annotated texts made up of material "suitable for imparting the habit and, in a manner, the vocabulary of scientific literature." To justify the first part of his title, M. Luquiens has selected from Elisée Reclus, Milne-Edwards, Flammarion and Toussenel. The more literary selections are from Michelet, Victor Hugo, Alexandre Dumas and Marc-Monnier.

Mr. Schoenhof is also the special agent in the United States for the school publications of the London house of Hachette & Co. The catalogue of this firm presents a more extensive and varied list of educational works for the study of French than any other in England or America. Leaving aside the numerous books for children, the grammars and readers, the following deserve notice as available texts. M. Gustave Masson's 'Choice Readings from French History' is a series in three volumes of which the intention is excellent. They are respectively entitled: I. 'From Roncevaux to

Montlhéry (778-1465);' II. 'From Pavia to the Death of Henry IV. (1525-1610);' III. 'From the Accession of Louis XIII. to the Battle of Waterloo.' They are provided with maps, indices, glossary and notes by the editor. They are made up of extracts, principally from the chroniclers and memoir writers, but also from the poets, chronologically arranged so as to present in succession the main events of French history as told by contemporaries. At least such appears to have been the aim of the publication. But there are unaccountable gaps. There would be room between the first and second part for an additional volume from 1465 to 1525. These first two parts, containing only French anterior to what is the classical or modern period, would be in place only in classes where old or, at the latest, sixteenth century French was studied, and for such, special Readers and Chrestomathies by specialists have been made both in France and in Germany. The best of the three parts is the third, though the extracts in this from Bassompierre, Fontenay-Mareuil, Mlle. de Scudéry and others would be found rather obscure by ordinary French pupils. The editor has besides undertaken the impossible task of presenting in 150 pages specimens of a very rich period of memoir writing. M. Gustave Masson has shown that he could do good work in this direction when he limited himself to one reign, as in his 'Louis XIV. and his contemporaries, as described in extracts from the best Memoirs of the Seventeenth Century' (Clarendon Press).

Passing over several pages of graduated Readers we come to the most interesting and original part of the Hachette (London) publications. This is the series provokingly and uniformly stamped on the back 'Modern Authors' I., II., III. and so on up to XXXV. at the present time. These are all neat volumes, well bound, varying in price from one shilling to 2s. 6d. They are all provided with notes some very abundantly indeed. As texts they are all valuable, presenting complete productions of some of the best modern French writers. The choice is scrupulously made from the strictest stand-point of English propriety. The first volume contains two of Edmond

About's most charming stories, 'La fille du Chanoine' and 'La Mère de la Marquise.' These are very easy and delightful reading, as are also the stories by Töpffer, Souvestre, and Enault published in the collection. Lacombe, 'Petite Histoire du Peuple français' is true to its title, but it will be disappointing to one who seeks in it for a continuous exposition of the facts of French history. It was not written for schools, but as a sort of popular republican tract addressed to the working classes of France, to show what they had gained by the Revolution and the abolition of ancient privileges. The language is very simple and straightforward, but it presents many difficulties, which M. Jules Bué the annotator has cleared up by an English translation, generally with no farther explanation.

The historical stories by Mme. De Witt (née Guizot) are intended for younger pupils. There are two in the series; 'Derrière les haies,' a picture of the Vendean war, and 'De Glaçons en Glaçons,' a story of Napoleon's invasion of Russia. 'Lascaris ou les Grecs au XV^e siècle' is a historical tale in Villemain's most brilliant style, composed in 1825 during the Greek struggle for independence. It is not difficult reading. The volume containing selections from Alfred de Musset is one of the most interesting and useful in the series. Everything in it is of high literary merit. There are two comedies: 'Il faut qu'une porte soit ouverte ou fermée' and 'On ne saurait penser à tout'; two charming stories in prose 'Croisilles' and 'Pierre et Camille'; and thirty-six pages of verse. All this gives as true an idea as can be given in a book for educational purposes of the author of 'Rolla' and 'Namouna,' the beauty and purity of whose language are so great that he deserves a place second to none as a model of French style.

The seventh volume of 'Modern Authors' is, Ponsard, 'Le Lion amoureux,' a rather prosy historical play in verse, of interest, however, as presenting a picture of French society under the Directory. It is difficult enough for advanced reading and is full of allusions to the events of the Revolution. The next two volumes bear the name of Guizot. They are 'Alfred le Grand, ou l'Angleterre sous les Anglo-Saxons' and 'Guillaume le Conquérant,

ou l'Angleterre sous les Normands.' The first is signed Guillaume Guizot, a name which will do for both father and son; the 'Guillaume le Conquérant' was avowedly written by Pauline Guizot and revised by the father. They both contain excellent historical reading, easy enough to be taken up during the first year of study. As an example of the poetic prose of the beginning of the century, one of the very best specimens perhaps, 'Les Aventures du dernier Abencerage' by Chateaubriand, is a very welcome publication. It is very short and very pretty, if a certain sentimentality of tone is not considered too offensive. There is, of course, the pomposity of expression inseparable from the labored prose of the author of 'Le Génie du Christianisme.' But as affording variety in the choice of texts of literary value, it is an excellent selection of easy French.

Number 11 is Scribe's 'Bertrand et Raton,' often published before; number 12 a work that has, of late, met with much favor in England, 'Lazare Hoche' by Emile de Bonnechose. This is a beautifully written biography. Nothing better could be selected by an instructor who wished to combine the study of a very interesting and very important period of French history with the study of the language.

Even this summary notice of the first twelve volumes of 'Modern Authors' shows that the London Hachette house has been successful in its attempt to furnish reading material that is not hackneyed. The series improves as it goes on, as what there is to say of the subsequent numbers will show.

FERDINAND BÖCHER.
Harvard University.

THE ANGLO-SAXON PERFECT PARTICIPLE WITH *habban*.

The object of this brief paper is to show approximately the light in which Anglo-Saxon antiquity regarded the past participle, when this participle was united with the auxiliary *habban*, viz. (1) as to whether, in analytically formed perfect and pluperfect tenses, the participle simply governed the direct object without agreeing with it, or (2) whether it agreed with the associated object as "predicate attribute." For the purposes of the discussion six

representative works and collections have been examined: the Anglo-Saxon Laws; the Chronicle; Beowulf; the 'Cædmon' poems; Gregory's Pastoral Care; and Wulfstan's Homilies. It is possible to gather from these six representative productions not only how far the Anglo-Saxon had proceeded on its way toward the simpler fashions of modern analytical verb-combinations, but also how these verb-combinations were treated with reference to the points just mentioned.

1. In the course of our investigation it turned out that these six works contained, as nearly as could be ascertained from a careful count, *six hundred* analytical forms with *habban*, distributed as follows:

Anglo-Saxon Laws (Schmidt's ed.)...	59
Chronicle (Thorpe's parallel edition)...	230
Beowulf (Heyne's edition).....	39
'Cædmon' (Bouterwek's edition).....	88
Gregory's Pastoral Care, Vol. I. (Sweet's edition).....	48
Gregory's Pastoral Care, Vol. II.....	66
Wulfstan's Homilies (Napier's ed.)....	70
Total,	600

2. Of these *six hundred* participial forms it was found that only *eighty-four* were inflected, namely, associated with an object as "predicate attribute." These were distributed as follows:

A.-S. Laws 9; Chronicle 30; Beowulf 2; 'Cædmon' 17; Pastoral Care, Vol. I, 11; Pastoral Care, Vol. II, 7; Wulfstan's Homilies 8—total, 84.

3. The *five hundred and sixteen* remaining (uninflected) participial forms were distributed as follows:

A.-S. Laws 50; Chronicle 200; Beowulf 37; 'Cædmon' 71; Pastoral Care, Vol. I, 37; Pastoral Care, Vol. II, 59; Wulfstan's Homilies 62—total, 516.

4. These, when sifted, distributed themselves into several categories according as they were associated with (1) transitive verbs having (a) direct objects (masc., fem. or neuter), (b) object clauses; (2) intransitive verbs having (a) genitive and dative objects, (b) no object at all.

The results assorted themselves as follows:

I.—ACCUSATIVE OBJECTS (including Object Clauses).

	Masc.	Fem.	Neuter and Obj. Cl.
A.-S. Laws.....	8 (including plurals)	5.....	21
Chronicle.....	42	" "	9.....32
Beowulf.....	13	" "	4.....9
'Cædmon'.....	36	" "	9.....12
Pastoral Care, Vol. I....	9	" "	5.....14
" " II.....	21	" "	4.....19
Wulfstan's Homilies....	28	" "	2.....13

REMARK.—Under each head there are several doubtful cases. In the Parallel Chronicle the same forms occur 2, 3, 4 or even 5 times, where one MS. has been copied from another.

II.—GENITIVE AND DATIVE OBJECTS AND INTRANSITIVES WITHOUT OBJECTS.

A.-S. Laws.....	11
Chronicle.....	9
Beowulf.....	8
'Cædmon'.....	8
Pastoral Care, Vol. I.*.....	6
" " II.....	4
Wulfstan's Homilies.....	9

5. Two results flow from these observations:

1. The incomprehensibility of such statements as these (Morris' Elementary Historical English Grammar, p. 134): "In the oldest period the [English] verb was inflected for the present and perfect [preterite-imperfect] only. . . . In the fourteenth century we find . . . the perfect expressed by the auxiliary *have* and the passive participle" (implying that before the fourteenth century such was not the case).

2. That Sweet's statement ('Anglo-Saxon Grammar,' p. xc.): "Originally these periphrastic forms (i. e. forms with *hæfth* and *hæfde* past participle) were employed only with transitive verbs, and the participle was put in the accusative case agreeing with the substantive, as is still the case in the older writings," must be received with extreme reserve.

A true Anglo-Saxon syntax, written without preconceptions or prejudice, facing all the phenomena, shirking none of the facts, has yet to be written.

JAMES A. HARRISON.

Washington and Lee University.

* The investigation seems to show that one of the MSS. of Gregory's Pastoral Care was copied from the other, so close is the correspondence in the form and number of the past participles.

**THE GERUNDIAL CONSTRUCTION
IN THE ROMANIC LANGUAGES, II.**

We have now to speak of the Provençal and French, which have been reserved for the last, because they belong to a special category, in that they have departed more widely from the parent speech than the others in their formal development, and hence have to be grouped by themselves. The Langue d'Oc preserved both the participle and the gerund of the Latin and, according to Diez's table of inflexions, the regular forms are: gerund *-an* and *en*; participle *an-s* and *en-s*; that is, the one being distinguished from the other only by the *s*. This distinction, however, was not always heeded. In fact, two of the old Provençal grammars, the "Donatz Proensals," and the "Razos de Trobar" of Raimon Vidal, make no such division in denominating the parts of the verb. The former, in speaking of the case-endings of nouns and adjectives, says: "Si cum sun li particip que finissen in *ans* uel *ens*, queu pos dire 'aquest chaual es presans, aquesta domna es presans, aquestz cauals es avinens, aquesta domna es avinens.' Mas el nominatiu plural se camia daitan que conven a dire 'aquelh chaual sun avinen, aquelas donas sun avinens'." In two or three other places, reference is made to the participle but there is no mention, throughout the whole treatise, of the gerund. Vidal likewise observes complete silence in respect to the distinction between gerund and participle, and we may infer that the former was regarded merely as the participle minus the *s*. The early Provençal writers were evidently not aware of any difference of origin; and there was no reason why they should have been, since the oldest documents present no forms with clearer outlines than those of a more recent date.

Like the Italian dialects above illustrated, the French modeled all its gerunds on the first conjugation, but went even further than these dialects and treated the present participle in the same manner.* Burguy, who, with all his

*We must go to the oblique cases for all the forms of the participle—even for the sibilant forms *ans*, *ans*. Latin *amans* would have given, not *amans*, *amans*, but *ames*, as *infans* gave *enfes*, while *infantem* produced *enfant*. So taking the accusative *amantem* as the norm, we should obtain analogously *amant* (later but incorrectly *aimant*). When the

short-comings, must be admitted to have been a scholar, assigns, as it seems to me, a strange reason for this. He says in this connection:

Le participe présent des quatre conjugaisons a toujours eu la flexion *ant*; on rejeta sans doute *en* (-ens) pour distinguer orthographiquement le participe de la troisième pers. pl. prés. ind. et parce que la prononciation de l'*e* devant *n* est la même que celle de l'*a*." This is making a statement in face of the fact that no such change of *e* to *a* was thought necessary, under like conditions, in Provençal. Moreover, it is not true, as is implied in the latter part of his sentence, that the participle and the third person pl. of the verb were pronounced alike. It is true that *en(t)* and *an(t)* assonate and rhyme with each other:

Femmes lui van detras seguen
Ploran lo van et gaimentan.

(La Passion, B. 11. 16).

Tel conseiller ne fut onques vivant
Ne plus sages homme à mon escent.

(Roman d'Aquin, l. 1612).

But in the case of the participle and the verb, there was one thing which completely distinguished the two forms to the ear, namely the tonic accent, which must have influenced the quality of the final vowels, that is, in *finissent* (verb) the last vowel would be either not heard at all or very obscurely, while in *finissent(em)*, the *e* would be a full sonorous sound.

If I may venture a suggestion myself, I would attribute the phenomenon to dialectic influence as seen in the Roman d'Aquin (trante, talant, planté, antrer, prandre, tandre, sanglant) and

flexional sibilant (*s*, *z*) was added, the dental dropped out. *Amando (-um)* appears in French only as *amant* (*aimant*); there was probably, however, an intermediate form, *amand*, the sonant then going over into its corresponding surd at a time when the final consonants were still sounded, (quando-quand is nearly always *quant* in O. F.). This process of euphony (i. e. ease of utterance according to the present definition), similar to the German, was the universal custom in early French and Provençal, and hence: *b=p*; *g=c*; *d=t*; *v=f*, (preserved in modern: *grand homme*, *sang et eau*, etc., which are pronounced: *grant homme*, *sank et eau*). These changes, as a general rule, took place, whether the sonants became final through the natural growth of the words out of the Latin or through inflexion. Only in the *Passion* and a few other poems do we observe a strong opposite dialectic tendency in respect to the final *t's*: *leved*, *anned*, *aproismed* *conforted*, *defended*, *acusand*.

elsewhere, where the *e* of the syllable *ens*, *en*, *ente*, *ent*, has become *a*; as *laians* (*laiens*) *present*, *eriant*, *chasement*, *povremant*, and the numerals in *ante* (*quarante*, *cinquante*, *soixante*, *septante*, *octante*, *nonante*) which must have passed through *ente* in becoming *ante*. Whatever may have been the cause of this change, the fact remains indisputable: all gerunds and present participles had the same terminations (*ant*, *ans*, *ant*) and there are no traces of *ent*-forms even in the earliest monuments of the language; for, what Wilhelm Bruno says in a dissertation which he presented to the University of Rostock, in 1871, has no bearing on the question whatever. After stating that the French "*adjectif verbal*" comes undoubtedly from the corresponding Latin forms in *ans* and *ens*, he continues: "Die Endung *ent* ist von vornherein fast aufgegeben" and then gives *dolent*, *présent*, *omnipotent*, as though they were genuine French participles, or verbal adjectives. The absurdity of this procedure is patent on the very face of it. In the case of the last two, there were no verbs on which to form them; while *doler* gave *dolant* as its participle. He has made the mistake of confounding words taken directly from the Latin with the cognate forms founded on French models. It seems to me it would be as reasonable to call *dolent*, *omnipotent*, *obedient* participles in English.

Quite a number of these Latin participles came into French at an early date, and a few have been added from time to time (the sixteenth century was especially prolific in their introduction), but they have preserved in the majority of cases their distinctive Latin characteristics as far as form is concerned, while the French participles have all along coexisted side by side with them. The following partial list will make plain my meaning:

FRENCH.	LATIN.
fatigant.	fatigant.
vaquant.	vacant.
excellant.	excellent.
intriguant.	intrigant.
présidant.	président.
résidant.	résident.
affluant.	affluent.
diffréant.	diffrént.
équivalant.	équivalent.
influant.	influent.
négligeant.	négligent.

Having discussed the etymological phases, something should now be said about the apparently interminable dispute in which French grammarians have indulged regarding the terminology to be employed in speaking of the several syntactical functions discharged by these verbal forms in *ant*.

The most common designation found in the grammars is *present participle*; but this appellation seeming too general to express all the offices performed by these words, grammarians began quite early to employ other names, such as, *adjectif verbal*, *gérondif*, &c.; but unfortunately they have not united on any term, or set of terms, to be used. The Academy thinks *gérondif* a misnomer as applied to French syntax. "Gérondif," it says, *se dit abusivement, dans notre langue, du participe actif, précédé de la préposition en, exprimée ou sousentendue.*" Girault-Duvivier and Bescherelle distinguish between *adjectif verbal*, *participe présent* and *gérondif*, according to their respective syntactical relations; while Diez (Grammatik III. pp. 256-262) terms the inflected form *participium*, the uninflected, *gerundium*. Mätzner, on the other hand, differs a little from all these in his nomenclature: "Seine Form," he says, "worin sich die lateinischen Formen auf *ans*, *ens* und *andum*, *endum* verschmolzen finden, erscheint im Satze theils unveränderlich als *gerundivisches participium*, theils als reines *Verbaladjectif*, welches fähig ist eine Feminin- und Plural-form anzunehmen."

This diversity of terminology is not of recent date; it began with the first grammarians and sprang out of the frequent confounding of the two parts of speech by the early writers, owing to the similarity of form and signification. Instance the following, where, after verbs of motion, the verbal ought to appear unchanged, as in the first example:

Autresi m'en irai, ce crei,
Cum jeo ving, tut murant de sei.
(Marie de France, B. 238, 8).

Au terme vient joians et liés.
(Flore et Blanceflor).

E ele desirad sa gunele et jetad puldre sur
son chief si s'en alad criante e plurante.
(Livre des Rois).

The same cause brought about a like confusion in Provençal :

Als faitz conoicheras las gens,
Que las paraulas van mentens.
(Le Libre de Senequa).

E la metia enans a son poder ab sas cancers
e en comtans.

(Bib. der Troub. XLII).

Antoine Oudin, tutor in Italian of Louis XIV, observing the divergence of opinion among French grammarians relative to the variability or non-variability of the verbals in *ant*, proposed in the first edition of his grammar, which appeared in 1632, to treat them as "gerondifs," whenever they retained their full verbal force. In this case they should remain uninflected. This he sets forth in these words :

• Ce participe, exprimant le gerondif, ne se doit point obliger à suivre ny le genre ny le nombre du substantif antecedant : verbi gratia : la terre produisant des fruits, et non pas la terre produisante, etc.; les roys asseurent leurs estats, traittant doucement leurs subjects, et non pas : traittans doucement, etc.; les femmes se fardant gastent leurs visages et jamais se fardans, etc. Mais s'il est pur participe relatif (c'est-à-dire adjectif verbal) il faut qu'il suive le genre et le nombre dudit antecedant, comme les roys cherissants, les subjects obeyssans, les femmes attrayantes; car alors il prend la nature d'adjectif. Je trouve une exception aux temps composéz du participe estant, car on dit : ces hommes estans entrez, mais ce n'est que pour le masculin, car on ne diroit pas : ces femmes estans entrées."

It is curious to observe how Vaugelas, whose "Remarques sur la langue françoise" came out fifteen years after the publication of Oudin's grammar, attempts to compound with the matter. After stating that it would be "barbare et ridicule" to say : je les ai trouvées ayantes le verre à la main and that ayans le verre à la main would not be more correct, he adds : il faut donc nécessairement avoir recours au gerondif quand il s'agit du feminin, soit au singulier, soit au pluriel, et dire en l'exemple que nous avons proposé : je les ai trouvées ayant le verre à la main." And again : "Donnons un exemple des participes actifs aux autres verbes : je les ai trouvées beuantes et mangeantes. Qui a jamais oyé parler comme

cela ? Il faut dire : je les ai trouvées beuant et mangeant, au gerondif. Il y en a pourtant qui soutiennent que ce participe actif feminin ne doit pas estre banny de nostre langue, quoy que neanmoins ils demeurent d'accord que l'usage en est tres-rare et que le gerondif mis en sa place sera meilleur sans comparaison." He seems, however, not to have had a clear conscience after having delivered himself of these words, for he adds further : au moins, il est bien certain qu'estant participe n'a pas de feminin et que jamais on n'a dit estante non plus qu'ayante, au feminin.

In 1660, the Port-Royalist grammarians, Arnauld and Lancelot, following the example of Oudin and Vaugelas, declared that the present participle was never anything else but a "gerondif," that it was consequently not susceptible of either gender or number and ought not to be declined. "Je dis que nos deux participes *aimant* et *aimé*, en tant qu'ils ont le même régime que le verbe, sont plutôt des gerondifs que des participes; car M. Vaugelas a déjà remarqué que le participe en *ant*, lorsqu'il a le régime du verbe, n'a point de féminin et qu'on ne dit point par exemple : 'j'ai vu une femme lisante l'Ecriture, mais lisant l'Ecriture.' Que si on le met quelquesfois au pluriel: 'j'ai vu des hommes lisants l'Ecriture,' je crois que cela est venu d'une faute dont on ne s'est pas aperçu, à cause que le son de *lisant* et de *lisants* est presque toujours le même, le *t* ni le *s* ne se prononçant point d'ordinaire."

This principle first enunciated by Oudin was founded in reason and was theoretically correct; and had he gone back to the earliest writers, he would have found it pretty well substantiated and obtained better results than he did, as far as the history of the language was concerned. As it was, his statement was not justified by the facts as he found them at his time; and there is little doubt but that he was led to make it by the beautiful system of the Italian gerund and participle, whose clearness is such that it would not unlikely have induced him to wish to see it substituted for the chaotic condition of the analogous construction in his mother-tongue. But as has been said, the usage of his time only partially legitimated the principle he claimed to be estab-

lished. For from the beginning of the fourteenth century the feminine *e* and flexional *s* began to invade the province of the gerund.†

En la splendur de la tue fuldrante hanste.
(Habakkuk, III. 11. (XI. century))

E com pesante destinee.
(Benoit de Sainte More. XII. century)

La chiere blanche plus que n'est flour de lis
Et revelante comme rose de pris.
(Roman d'Aquin, I. 310. XII. century.)

L'espee a quainte tranchante a son coste.
(Ditto I. 1202.)

Parmi le cors li vait bruiante,
De l'autre part fiert en la lande.‡
(Gormuud et Isembard, I. 75. XIII. cent.)

The confusion having been once made, it went on increasing until 1679, when the Academy issued its famous decree: "La règle est faite, on ne déclinera pas les participes actifs."

The reason which the members of that august body assigned for this decision, was that they were but following the example "de nos anciens, pour lesquels nous devons avoir beaucoup de considération; car ils ont toujours posé pour règle certaine que les verbes actifs n'ont pas de vrais participes mais seulement des gérondis, qui tiennent lieu de participes, gardant le régime de leurs verbes et se joignant avec les noms masculins et féminins singuliers et pluriels, sans être déclinables et sans être d'aucun genre, par exemple: l'homme craignant Dieu; les hommes craignant Dieu; la femme craignant Dieu; les femmes craignant Dieu."

This seems a little like inspiration, unless we are to take the words *nos anciens* and *toujours* as very limited in meaning and application; for we have no reasons to believe that they had any very definite knowledge of Old French syntax. But what they did, although often contravened by practice, was in the main right; for they had the analogy of all the other Romance languages on their side. When we find the Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and Wallachian using the gerund in certain constructions such as:

† Sporadic instances of the feminine *e* with the participle made their appearance in the preceding centuries.

‡ In this last example the *e* has also been added to the gerund, similarly to a case already noticed. The addition of this feminine *e* must have acted as a potent cause in helping to confound the two parts of speech, already no longer distinguishable by their form.

E in umil seggio, e in un vestire schietto
Fra' suoi duci sedendo il ritrovaro.

(Tasso, Gerus. Lib. II. 60).

Llegó il cuadrillero, y como los halló hablando en tan sosegada conversación quedó suspenso.

(Don Quijote, Part I. ch. XVII).

E tornando, achou-os outra vez dormindo.

(Marco, XIV. 40).

Si a venit, si l-á gasit dormindt.

(Marc, XIV. 37);

that is, with the verb *to find*, there seems to be no plausible ground for regarding the French and Provençal construction as of different origin. Compare with the above the following:

Sor une grant coute vermoille

Troverent la dame s'ant.

(Chevalier au Lyon, B. 160. 18).

E qand venc un dia, Raimons del Castel Rosillon trobet passan Guillem de Cabestaing.
(Bib. der Troub. IX).

As far as possible an effort will be made in the following pages to treat the subject from this standpoint—namely to show by citations from the co-related languages what constructions ought to be considered gerundial, when speaking of French and Provençal.

This method of treatment has not been, as far as I know, proposed and no doubt will be objected to by some, especially by those who are not willing to admit the term "gerund" in French grammar, but who maintain that, inflected or uninflected, the verbal form *ant* is nothing but a participle. Little will be gained by it, I admit, as we can not now make the language over; but the distinction between gerund and participle once accepted, we see why the early authors considered themselves at liberty to add the *s* (*z*) or not. As has been said, they were probably not aware that the words in *ant* issued from more than one source—nay, possibly did not think of the subject at all, but they knew that custom had sanctioned both the use and the omission of the sibilant.

I find little relevancy in what has been so much insisted on with reference to the exigencies of the rime causing the violation of the rule; for while it is true that the so-called rule for the participle is frequently violated in the rimes, we can not lay much stress on this fact, as the non-sibilated forms are met too often out of rime and in prose, to be regarded as

mere orthographical blunders. Moreover, it is not uncommon to find the sibilant in the rimes where it is not called for and *vice versa*. And again, the argument would only hold good, in any case, for pure rime; because the assonances did not depend on the consonants, but on the vowel-element of the final strong syllable. Take the following passage from Guillaume d'Orange, a clear specimen of rime:

Li cuens Guillaumes fu iriez et dolanz,
Vivien vit qui gisoit to sanglanz,
Plus soef flere que basme ne pimens.
Sor sa poitrine tenoit ses mains croisant;
Li sans li ist par ambedeus les flans,
Par mi le cors ot quinze plaias granz,
De la menor fust mort uns amiranx.
'Niés Vivien,' dit Guillaume li frans,
'Mar fu vo cors qui tant par iert vaillant.'

And another from the Chanson de Roland, an assonated poem:

De mun osberc en sunt remput li pan;
Plaies ai tantes es costez e es flancs
De tutes parz en salt fors li clers sancs;
Trestut le cors m'en vait afeblant;
Semprez murrai, par le mien esciant.
Je suis vostre hum e vus tien à guarant;
Ne me blasmez, se je m'en vai fuiant.

Innumerable instances might be cited out of rime and in prose; a few only are given:

Il est issus del bos, vint el lairis,
Galopant vait vers aus tou le cemin.
(Aiol et Mirabel).

Donc vint edrant dreitement à la mer.
Eist de la neif e vait edrant à Rome.
(St. Alexis).

Le cheval brochet, si vient poignant vers lui,
(Ch. de Roland).

Si home ocit alter e il seit cunussant, &c.
(Lois de Guillaume le Conq.).

La voz del segnur frainanz les cedres—
La voiz del segnur entretençant la flamme.
(Psalm XXIX.).

Trestot a pié, defendant son parti.
(Garin le Loherain).

Plorant li bese le piz et la forcele.
(Guil. d'Orange).

Je vois querant tun pru, t'honor.
(Myst're d'Adam).

Mult par lu vait criant merci.
(Tristan).

Qui tostens va sivant amor.
(Benoit de Sainte More).

Quant je ving ça corrant a toi.
(Ditto).

Parlant les a issi menez au cors.
(Romania VIII. 177).

Dolanz m'en part.

(Romances, thirteenth century).

Vers Castres s'en repairet joians et esbaidis.

(Le Siège de Castres (Rom. Stud. I. 591)).

Et en tel estat fesoient le silence attendans le jour qui vint tantost.

(Jehan Froissart).

C'est une cité de la marine qui siet en la terre de Fenice et est obeissant à la cité de Sur.

(Tr. de Guil. de Tyr.).

.... un povres hons fuoit mont criant devans un ors.
(Ditto).

Je servirai desirans toute voie.

(Guilot de Provins).

E la metia enans a son poder ab las cansose en comtans.
(Bib. der Troub.).

Non posc mudar, bels amics, qu'en chantanz, &c.
(Ugo Catola).

The above quotations, which might be increased to any number, will suffice to show that verbals in *ant* might remain unchanged or take the sibilated forms *ans*, *anz*. I do not believe this is attributable to a mere whim or accident. There must have been a reason for it.

For the sake of convenience the same terminology, as that of Diez, had been determined upon, even before consulting him on the subject; and the writer was glad to have his resolution sanctioned by such an authority. But before proceeding to the syntax, another point must be mentioned, which comes properly under this heading; that is, the compound forms of the gerund.

Having created this special construction from the simple gerund (for it differs in so many ways from the Latin, that it may almost be said to be a new creation), the Romanic languages went further and constructed a past tense as well as a passive voice, by means of the auxiliary verbs *habere* and *essere*: Fr. *ayant aimé*, *étant aimé*, *ayant été aimé*; It. *avendo amato*, *essendo amato*, *essendo stato amato*; Sp. *habiendo amado*, *siendo amado*, *habiendo sido amado*; Port. *tendo (havendo) amado*, *sendo amado*, *tendo sido amado*.

In this way they remedied what we feel to be a weakness in the parent speech, which had no perfect active participle, and not having, strictly speaking, any auxiliary verbs, was obliged to make the passive participle serve

for both present and past. The Roman could not literally say: Cæsar having crossed the bridge attacked the enemy, but: Cæsar, the bridge crossed, attacked enemy. French, César ayant passé le pont attaqua l'ennemi, or retaining the Latin construction: César, le pont passé, attaqua l'ennemi, or even: César passant le pont attaqua l'ennemi; It. Cesare avendo passato il ponte attaccò l'inimico, or: Cesare, passato il ponte, attaccò, &c., or: Cesare passando il ponte attaccò l'inimico. And so in the other languages, the Wallachian excepted, which seems to make the simple forms serve for all moods and tenses. I say this with some hesitancy, basing my belief on the silence of Diez, Barciană, Mircesco and others and on my own observation, which, it is true, is not very great in Wallachian literature. A number of parallel passages in the Bible show that, where the most of the other languages use the compound tense or some other equivalent, the Wallachian renders the same by the simple gerund. At any rate my experience is sufficiently extensive to justify me in asserting that the compound, if it occurs at all, is very exceptional.

SAMUEL GARNER.

Indiana University.

ANGLO-SAXONICA.

þ.

Just one year ago, cf. 'M. L. NOTES' I. p. 88, I argued the undesirability of expanding this MS. sign in critical editions, and showed that so far from representing merely *pæt*, it might stand for *þa*, *þæs*, *þone* (or *þam*, *þan*), *þio* and *þe*. My reference to *þ mycele gylp*, Blickl. 53/21 did not pass unchallenged. Sievers immediately called my attention privately to the accusative *ðæt idelgylp* Past. 457/23, *on suelc gylp* 71/1 as evidences of the word being—sporadically at least—neuter. Not to speak of *þ mycele* itself, where the *-e* is neuter inflexion. Kluge also wrote: "Ihr Artikel über *þ* enthält gewiss richtige Beobachtung u. ich gestehe dass ich bisher bei der Lectüre hie u. da (ohne mir Notizen darüber zu machen) *þ* für Schreibfehler für *þe* gehalten habe. Auch jetzt nach Ihren Sammlungen möchte ich lieber einen Schreibfehler annehmen als Dop-

pelwertigkeit des *þ*. Ueber *gylp* findet sich eine Notiz in Cosijn II."

Sievers, Kluge, and Cosijn are a formidable trio, and nothing could be farther from my wish than to try to controvert them. But is there any need of treating this point as one which does not admit of mutual adjustment? First as to Kluge. Why may we not regard the sign *þ* as standing for two or more words of different phonetic and grammatical value? In many a manuscript, for example, the Durham Gospels, we read in the Latin the sign *7* as *et*, and in the interlinear gloss just above we read it as *and* (or *ond*). Similarly *t* is read *vel* or *oððe*. In an Irish gloss the *7* would be read *ocus*. What serious objection can there be to considering *þ* a mere convenient abbreviation for a number of monosyllabic words having the same *Anlaut* and akin in sense, as the German student of to-day in his *Heft* abbreviates *der*, *die*, *das*, *dem*, *den* to *d.*? Not to speak of *ð* used continually in the Durham Ritual for *ðurh*, *ðorh* = *per*.

As to *gylp* being both masculine and neuter, it would be foolish to deny the possibility. Gender is by no means the inflexible quality that modern school grammars make it. In Anglo-Saxon we find a noun varying its gender not only from dialect to dialect, and from century to century, but even on the same page of the same text! Thus, Sievers points to *ðæt idelgylp* Past. 457/23; but on the same page, line 33, is to be read *ðone gylp*; and again, 459/1. As regards the *ðæt* in 457/23 may not Sweet have erroneously expanded *þ*? I have counted the number of times that *ðæt* occurs in this connection, namely, pp. 457, 459, 461; the figures are: *ðæt* conjunction (including *ðætte* and *oððet*) 36 times; *ðæt*, pron. art., 18 times; total 54. Not once the sign *þ*. This wears an ominous look. It is too uniform, it drives one to the inference that Sweet has normalized the *þ* throughout his edition of the Pastoral. Let us bear in mind that the Pastoral was his first great undertaking, and that it was done nearly twenty years ago. Not to speak of the Oldest English Texts, which of us will hesitate to pronounce the Orosius much better work? Without finding fault with a self-sacrificing editor who has put us all under lasting obligations, may not one of his bene-

ficiaries raise the direct question: How far does the Pastoral represent literatim the manuscript? And on this particular point, does the MS. *invariably* write out *ðæt*? An explicit assurance from Mr. Sweet (or some expert of equal rank) will, of course, be more satisfactory than any amount of conjecture. Meanwhile, let me call attention to the following, Past. 457/28: *Ne scyle ðeah nan mon for ðæm anum ðingum dón ðæt ðæt he to góða deð, ðæt he ne ðyrfe his hlaſord ondrædan, ne eſt for ðæm anum ðe he wilnige eorðlices loſes.* Translated: "Yet no man must do the good he does, merely that he may not have cause to fear his Lord; or, again, for the desire of earthly praise." This rendering effaces the evident syntactic parallelism of the two motive-clauses. I should prefer to render: "merely because he may fear his Lord or because he may desire, etc." And I suspect that the MS. reads *ð he ne ðyrfe*, the *ð* standing for *þe*. So, p. 459/1 *for ðæm ðæt* might be read *för ðæmðe* cf. NOTES, vol. I. p. 88.

Sievers's inference that *mycele* Blickl. 53/21 is neuter inflexion still remains. There are only two ways of disposing of it: either to assume *mycele* to be a blunder for *mycela* (masc.), or to admit that the weak adj. decl. is capable of an occasional abnormality.

If the reader wishes further instances of *þ*, *ð* not equivalent to *pæt*, he may consider the following:

þ gise[þ]tan = ordinatissimam, Epinal 707. Sweet asterisks the *ð* as if a blunder!

þ metbælig, Luke xxii, 36 Lind., *ðone* Rushw. *þ foſtrað*, John vi, 49 Lind., *ðone* Rushw. *Sacculum=þ seam*, Luke xxii, 36 Lind., *ðonne seom* Rushw. *þ wæs wunden gold on wæn hladen*, Beow. 3134. Had not Zupitza been committed to a doctrine, would he have transliterated *pæt*, instead of the more obvious *þa*, or *þær*?

þ, ð.

Bremer's article on "Germanisches *þ*," Beiträge xi, 1-76, 262-286, is certainly full of suggestions. Whether all the author's deductions will be accepted just as they stand, is a matter which I must leave to critics capable of broader generalizations than mine. What directly interests me is Bremer's collection of examples from Anglo-Saxon.

By the way, it is surprising to see Merogaisus, p. 19, *Meroſledis*, p. 21, *Merulfus*, p. 22, cf. p. 25, set down as *mér-*. Are they not rather *mér-*, 'sea, meer?' Equally puzzling are the remarks, p. 32, on *ræden*, *hiwraðen*. The form *ræden* is an independent noun, cf. Sievers § 258, Anm. 3, Cosijn I. § 88, p. 103, Kluge §§ 149, 162, *conditio=ræden* Haupt, 436 a/1; *hiwraðen* is no more folk-etymology than are *ðegen-ræden*=retinue, *lim-ræden*=χλαυτίς.

The gist of Bremer's conclusions is to be found pp. 271-286. His fundamental position is an Ablaut-scale *þ, ð, a*, representing respectively high, secondary, and lowest accent-grades. This is easy enough to grasp, but much less easy to apply to the actual phenomena of Anglo-Saxon. *þ*=Wessex (*ð*) *ð*, *ð*=*ð*, *a=a, æ*.

The difficulty lies in adjusting Bremer's accentuation with the consonantal changes according to Verner's law. Verner and his followers have taught us that wherever we get in An.-S. *d*, High-German *t*=Ind. Germ. *t*, we must assume the accent to be elsewhere than on the vowel immediately preceding this consonant. The same holds good of the change *s>z>r*.

If, then, as Bremer holds, p. 278, *blæd* 'renown,' *blæd* 'fruit,' *blæd* 'leaf,' are representatives of Ind. Germ. *blæt*, *blæt*, *blæt*, how can we get *blæd* from *blæti*=*blætē*? The consonantal change *t>p>ð>d* demands that the chief accent be not on the root-syllable. A like difficulty is offered by *sæd* 'seed,' *græd* 'greed,' *præd* 'thread,' *blædre* 'bladder,' *glære* 'amber,' *mæðe* 'tired' (cf. Kluge § 233, suffix -tyo). In this last word, the English consonant demands root-accent, the umlauting demands suffix-accent.

On the other hand, *bræð* 'breath,' *cræd* 'crowing,' *spæd* 'prosperity' seem to meet all requirements.

The problem is complicated by the observation that outside of the domain of strict Wessex we find *sæd*, *præd*, *blædre*, *græd* 'grass' (evidently connected with *grōwan*, *grāwan*), *spæd* 'spittle' (*spāwan*) cf. Sweet, O. E. T. pp. 605, 606. Nowhere *sæd*, *præd*, *blædre*, *græd*, at least if Sweet's index is to be trusted; that is to say, the *þ* cannot be *i*-umlaut of *ð*. Whereas we do get *spæd*, p. 650; neither *cræd* nor *croed*, nor *bræð* occur in Sweet's index.

Bremer will have to reconsider, I fear, some of his Germanic stems. Also some of his English words. Thus *sneār*, p. 278 should be *sneārh*, lengthened in oblique cases to *sneārh*—by dropping of *h*, Sievers, Beiträge x, 488. Bremer takes no note of the *-h*. Where is An.-S. *blēsan* (p. 281) to be found? Not in Sweet's O. E. T., nor in Bosworth-Toller, nor in Wright-Wülker, and expressly rejected by Kluge in his Wörterbuch. As to *grētan* parallel to *grēotan* 'to weep,' it is also a grammatical fiction.

jehon, gēon, to say, assert.

Has the possibility of this verb (=M. H. G. *jehēn*) occurring in English been pointed out? Paul, M. D. Gr., § 162, ranks *jehēn* in Class V. of the Ablauting verbs. Its proper place in An.-Saxon would be in Sievers, § 391. 2, by the side of *gefēon, plēon*, etc., among the verba contracta.

The only evidence known to me of its existence in An.-Saxon is *conticinium=cwyltid t gebedgiht*, Wr. W. 117/9 (Aelfric's Vocab.). *cwyltid* evidently=(Danish) Icelandic *kveld-timi* 'evening;' *cwīld* in Sweet, O. E. T., p. 499, relieves us of necessity of assuming a direct borrowing from the Danish, although this peculiar use betrays Danish influence. *gebed-giht* must mean "prayer-saying." *Conticinium* is frequently used in mediæval Latin to denote a canonical hour, for example, *conticinium t gallicinium=hancred* Wr. W. 175/36 (Suppl. to Aelf. Vocab.), and 426/10, note. *giht* is analogous in formation to *tyht (tēon)* Sievers, § 266.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

'THE ROMAUNT OF THE ROSE' AND
PROFESSOR SKEAT'S VOCAB-
ULARY TEST.

In the third edition of his Chaucer's 'Prioresses Tale' (Oxford, 1880), and again in the Chaucer Society's Essays, Part V, pp. 437-451, Professor Skeat adduces various reasons why 'The Romaunt of the Rose' cannot be Chaucer's translation. Disregarding, for the present, his other proofs, I shall confine myself in this paper to an examination of his Vocabulary

Test, as treated in the Essays, pp. 447-450, especially under C, his third division.

Professor Skeat says: "Whoever will really read the translation, must be struck with the extraordinary number of unusual words in it, especially of words which never occur in Chaucer. Many of these words have been attributed to Chaucer over and over again, but solely on the strength of the translation, and quite erroneously" (p. 445). Under C he adds (p. 447): "The translation abounds with remarkable words; the translator was a great master of language, with a vocabulary of his own; but many of his words are to be found in Barbour, Wyclif, the Promptorium Parvulorum, Havelok, and Piers Plowman, rather than in Chaucer." Of these words he then notes 189, not counting repetitions of the same word.

Without entering upon an exhaustive discussion of the vocabulary of the 'Romaunt,' I hope to show:

1. That, of the peculiar words noted, a large proportion are in no true sense the translator's own, but are directly or indirectly borrowed from his original, while in many other cases they are required by some exigency of his verse.

2. That some of these words are to be found in one of Chaucer's undoubted poems.

3. That, disregarding such considerations as are brought forward in 1 and 2, it is unsafe to found an argument concerning the genuineness of a work upon the peculiar words which it exhibits, when compared with the admitted productions of the author in question.

These positions will now be examined in detail.

1. An examination of the words instanced will cast some light upon the originality displayed in selecting or appropriating them. They may be arranged under the following sub-divisions:

A. Old French riming words retained and slightly Anglicized, the associate riming word being similarly retained and Anglicized: *accusith* 1591; *allege* 6628; *aqueyntable* 2213; *assise* 1237; *avenaunt* 1263; *batayled* 4162; *baude* 5677; *beau sire* 6056; *bygyns* 6863; *bygynne* 7368; *bordillers* 7036; *bosarde* 4033; *cherisaunce* 3337; *conisaunce* 5468; *custommere* 4939; *entailed*

140, *entayle* 162; *equipolences* 7078; *espleiten* 6177; *flourettes* 891; *gysarme* 5981; *gousfaucoun* (error for *gonfanon*) 1201, *gonfenoun* 2018; *habiten* 660; *hay* 54; *kamelyne* 7367; *maistrise* 4172; *moysoun* 1677; *moneste* 3579; *musarde* 3256, 4034; *pesyble* 7413; *purprise* 4171; *racyne* 4884; *ramage* 5387; *sarlynsh* (for *sarsynsh*) 1188; *seignurie* 3213; *sukkenye* 1232; *tapinage* 7363; *trechoures* 197; *vermayle* 3645.

B. Old French riming words retained and slightly Anglicized, the associate riming word being changed: *bayly* 7574; *condyse* 1414; *conestablerye* 4218; *espirituel* 650 (cf. 672); *ravysable* 7018; *truaundise* 6666; *vendable* 5807.

C. Old French words introduced into the riming position, to chime with the Old French word which is retained and slightly Anglicized (the O. F. word introduced being a substitute, of course, for an unavailable original): *archangel* 915 (for *mesanges*, riming with *anges*); *avaunt* 3958 (for *tremblant*, riming with *semblant*); *baillie* 4302 (for *saisie*, riming with *Jalousie*); *chevesaile* 1082 (for *faillie*, riming with *taille*); *clapers* 1405 (for *tesnieres*, riming with *manieres*); *groine* 7051 (for *longe*, riming with *longe*); *maletalent* 274 (for *ledement*, riming with *torment*); *pousle* 6486 (for *planté*, riming with *povreté*); *roynous* 988 (for *eschardeus*, riming with *hideus*); *roignous* 6193 (for *fieus*, riming with *religieus*). Compare, in the O. F. *Roman de la Rose* (ed. Fr. Michel), *baillie* 386, *cheveçaille* 1177, *groignoie* 20752, *maltalent* 322, *poestes* 923.

D. Other words introduced into the riming position, to chime with the Old French word, which is retained and slightly Anglicized: *foxerie* 6797 (for *renardie*, riming with *papelardie*); *swire* 325 (for *desciree*, riming with *iree*).

E. New riming words, introduced in pairs, to imitate the riming sounds of the original pairs: *avaunt*: *devyaunt* 4793 (orig. *devant*: *vant*); *cowardise*: *disprise* 2490 (orig. *entrepris*: *mespris*); *disrewlilye*: *companye* 4903 (orig. *compaignies*: *vies*; here *disrewlilye* is adapted from orig. *desordenees*); *mycher*: *lyer* 6543 (orig. *tierres*: *mentierres*).

F. Riming words due to the search for a sound which shall chime with that of the literal translation of the original riming word: *byhove*: *love* 1092 (orig. *aimer*); *doole*: *hoole* 2364 (orig.

tout); *erke*: *werke* 4870 (orig. *ovre*); *fairhede*: *nede* 2484 (orig. *convendra*); *gadelyng*: *Swetelokyng* 938 (orig. *Dous-Regars*); *ribanynges* (orig. *orfrois*; cf. *clarionynges* H. F. III 152); *kings* 1077 (orig. *rois*); *scantilone* (O. F. *eschantillon*, in the thirteenth century *Livre des Metiers*); *stone* 7066 (orig. *pierre*); *semelyhede*: *wede* 777 (orig. *cotes*); *semelyhede* (orig. *biaute*); *lede* 1130 (orig. *tint parmi la main*); *unhide* (orig. *espoigne*); *abide* 2168 (orig. *atendre*).

G. Adaptations of rimes or other words in the original line: *doole* 2956 (orig. *dolui*); *fiaunce* 5484 (orig. *fier*, cf. O. F. *fiance*, R. R. 15, 4667); *pouste*: *mendicite* 6535 (orig. *poissance*: *mendicite*); *tonrette* 4164 (orig. *torneilles*); *truandynge*: *lyvng* 6723 (orig. *truandie*: *vie*); *tymbestere* 769 (orig. *tymberresses*).

H. Partial translation of an O. F. word, and adaptation of its ending for the sake of rime (Oliphant mentions Chaucer's liking for this termination, *New English* I 114): *chideresse* 4266 (*tencerresse* R. R. 142).

I. Old French words retained, or slightly Anglicized, but not in the rime: *aguler* 98; *aleys* 1377; *almandres* 1363; *arblasters* 4196; *awmener* 2087; *baundon* 1163; *bothum* 1721; *burnet* 226; *caleweis* 7045; *canelle* 1370; *chelaundre* 81; *ci ergis* 6251; *coynes* 1374; *cotidien* 2401; *decoped* 843; *distincte* 6202; *engreveth* 3444; *farce* 2285; *fardeles* 5686; *kernels* 4195; *loigne* 3882; *maysondewe* 5622 (orig. *Ostel-Dieu*, but *meson-Dieu* in Joinville, and no doubt in common use); *mavys* 619; *mycches* 5588; *mourdaunt* 1094; *orfrays* 562, 869; *papelaide* 7283; *portecolys* 4168; *preterit* 5014; *pryme temps* 4750; *quarels* 1823; *tymbres* 772; *trashed* 3231; *urchon* 3135 (suggested by the rime word *hericies*, but cf. the etymon *hericons* R. R. 2340); *wyndre* 1020.

J. Old French words, or derivatives of them, used in some other line of the original R. R.: *agree* 4349 (orig. *en gre* 2115, 2820, cf. *agrea* 795); *anoy* 4404 (orig. *anui* 3284, *anniz* 17); *attour* 3718 (orig. *atour* 810); *burdoun* 3401 (orig. *bordon* 13014); *endoute* 1664 (orig. *doutes* 2001); *havoire* 4723 (orig. *avoir* 5627, 5888); *persaunt* 2809 (orig. *perçans* 17080); *saile* 7338 (orig. *saillir* 6147); *sojour* 4282 (orig. *sejor* 1825); *spannyshinge* 3633 (orig. *espanir* 1651, *espanie* 3382); *verger* 3831, *vergere* 3618 (orig. *vergier* 130, *vergiers* 102); *volunte* 5279 (orig. *volente* 2021).

K. Other Old French words in established use: *acoye* 3564 (cf. 2 below); *orribilité* 7189 (*orribile* in Chaucer's contemporary, Guillaume de Nangis, but probably borrowed by the translator from Eustache Deschamps, Chaucer's admirer, who has "*orribile amere*").

L. The following words from various sources: *alpes* 658; *among* 3771; *anker* 6351; *baggyngly* 292; *bastyng* 104; *bynomeu* 1509; *bimene* 2667; *bleyne* 553; *bolas* 1377; *clipsi* 5352; *closer* 4069; *congeete* 6930; *coured* 465; *distoned* 4248; *dywned* 360; *eisel* 217; *elde* 391; *faverous* 84; *felden* 911; *fordwined* 366; *forfare* 5391; *forsongen* 664; *forwandred* 3336; *forwelked* 361; *forwered* 235; *fresshe* 1513; *gate* 3332; *girdilstede* 826; *glowmbe* 4356; *gospelere* 6889; *grete* 4116; *hulstred* 6149; *joyne* 2355; *knoppis* 1080 (*knoppe* 1702, *knopped* 7260); *laverokkes* 662; *merke* 5342; *metely* 822; *nokked* 942; *obeysshing* 3380; *onde* 148; *mynoresse* 149; *peire* 6106; *Poope-holy* 415; *pullaylle* 7045; *quene* 7034; *querrour* 4149; *reeft* 2661; *revelyng* 7262; *rympled* 4495; *ryve* 5396; *royne* 553; *roket* 1240 (*rochette* 4757); *rokynge* 1906; *sailouris* 770; *seer* 4752; *slowe* 4754; *soleyn* 3896; *spryngoldes* 4191; *tatarwages* 7259; *trepeget* 6282; *wugoodly* 3741; *vekke* 4286, 4495; *welmeth* 1561; *wery* 6267; *wode-wales* 658; *youthede* 4934.

It may not be possible to account quite satisfactorily for every one of these sixty-six words under L, but there are few that present any peculiar difficulty, or that would be necessarily inadmissible in Chaucerian verse. Professor Skeat makes much of the Northern forms, and indeed one is tempted to think of Northern influence as apparent in such words as *gate*, *laverokkes*, *nokked*. But are we therefore obliged to conclude that Chaucer could not have employed them? If so, is it on the ground that he belongs to the South? To that it may be replied that *gate* and *laverock* are used by Southern authors of that century and earlier, and that *gate*, in the compound *algates*, is found in Chaucer. Professor Skeat says: "The word *fand* is just as clear an indication of Northern dialect (to those who can see) as the use of the present participle in *-and*" (p. 443). What then, are we to make of *hald*, *Houſe of Fame* III. 219? Mr. Kington Oliphant, in his recent book, *The New English*, comments on several of Chaucer's poems. On the

'Parliament of Fowls,' the 'A B C,' and 'Ane-lida and Arcite,' his first note is: "We see *k* replace *ch*, as in the North; *lykerous* for *lecherous*." But this is by no means the only place where he has occasion to speak of the Northern element in Chaucer. Thus (I 109): "On the other hand there are many forms and phrases that have by this time come down from the North, such as" etc.; (I 110): "He uses the Northern *werre* (pejor) for the sake of the rime;" (I 116): "Chaucer's 'House of Fame' must have been written soon after his 'Troilus.' There are here the Northern phrases *how that*, *woful*, *alleskynnes*, *pel*, *as now*." With all this, have we not evidence enough that Chaucer could use an occasional Northern form, without ceasing to be Chaucer?

As to other words under L, *Alpes* is not known to occur again, except once in an old lexicon. *Among* is good Southern English in this sense, and so is *anker*. *Baggyngly* has not been found elsewhere, but Chaucer has *baggeth*; Bk. Duch. 623. *Bastyng* is of O. F. origin. *Bynomen* is the participle of a verb found in Chaucer. *Bimene* is common in M. E., and *bleyne*, a good O. E. word, is not rare. *Bolas* is O. F. *Clipsi* is apparently coined from the verb. *Closer* seems to be modified from the corresponding O. F. noun. *Distoned* rests upon a false interpretation of the original, and so does *eisel*, for O. F. *lesu* (*lixivium*). *Faverous* should probably be *savourous*, as Speght reads, though possibly coined for this place. The words with prefix *for*- ought not to occasion suspicion, since Chaucer's genuine works contain examples of such as do not otherwise occur in M. E. *Girdilstede*, *glowmbe*, *gospelere*, *grete*, *hulstred* are not confined to the North. *Joyne* may be a mistake, influenced by the original *doins*. *Obeysshing* is no doubt coined for the sake of the rime. *Mynoresse* (MS. reading) is usually regarded as a clerical blunder. *Poope-holy* seems to be an adaptation of *papelardie*. *Rympled*: the verb is assigned to Chaucer by Oliphant (I 129), who rejects 'The Romaunt of the Rose.' With *trepeget* cf. *tregetour*, H. F. III 170, 187. *Slowe* is unique in this sense in M. E., though there is an O. E. *slw*; the original has *taigne*. *Youthede* may have been employed for the sake of the rime.

2. A search through *Troilus and Cressida* shows that certain words in Professor Skeat's Index Expurgatorius are Chaucerian: *acoie* V 782; *cowardyse* IV 574, V 412; *groyn* (?) I 349; *lakken* I 189. It may also be remarked that Professor Skeat rarely follows the MS. in the spelling of the words quoted.

3. But, finally, supposing all the words cited are peculiar to this poem, does that prove that Chaucer was not the translator? If so, how shall we explain the following, from the Legende of Goode Women, and not occurring, to my knowledge, elsewhere in Chaucer? In quoting, I number the lines consecutively throughout: *agroteyd* 2453; *appeteth* 1580; *bedote* 1345; *box (alapa)* 1386; *byker* 2660; *clyffe* 1496; *clyves* 1468; *clywe* 2014 ff.; *cogge* 1479; *colver* 2317; *conduyte* 852 (plur. in R. R.); *costrel* 2665; *crokes* 640; *crynkled* 2010; *dishereted* 1063; *embosed* 1198; *flourouns* 217, 220; *foreyne* (in this sense) 1960; *grapenel* 640; *hacches* 648; *helis* 863; *heroneer* 1118; *lavendere* 358; *les* 1543; *los* 1512; *losengeour* 352 (but *losengere* R. R. 1050); *orde* 645; *panter* 131; *parements* 1104; *plenere* 1605; *radevore* 2351; *regals* 2126; *renomee* 1511; *roggeth* 2707; *sithe* 646; *skarmysshyne* 1908; *stakereth* 2686; *stames* 2359; *swolowe* 1102; *tabouren* 354; *totolere* 353; *wittirly* 2605.

Ought we, on the faith of these, to doubt Chaucer's authorship of the Legende of Goode Women?

Though the subject of this paper is the Vocabulary Test, and my discussion was to be restricted to this narrower field, I can not forbear to ask, in relation to Tests II, and IV, Assonant and Strange Rimes, whether Chaucer should be expected to employ more perfect rimes than Lorris, who has *desplese*: *blandist*, vv. 3155-6, and *treuve: œuvre*, p. 134 (ed. Fr. Michel, Paris 1864).

ALBERT S. COOK.

University of California.

THE FINNSBURG-FRAGMENT AND THE FINN-EPIISODE.

In Paul und Braune's Beiträge, XII, Prof. Bugge gives a number of notes on Béowulf in which he treats, among other matters, the Finnsburg-Fragment and its relation to the Finn-Episode (p. 20 ff.). In his discussion of

this interesting subject he rejects Möller's theory (Das Altenglische Volksepos, p. 65 ff.) according to which the combat described in the Fragment took place *after* the treaty between Finn and Hengest, and declares himself in favor of Grein's conjecture that the contents of the Fragment are to be placed at the *head* of the Episode. In thus returning to what is now generally considered an *überwundener Standpunkt*, it was necessary for him to prove the fallacy, in every point, of Möller's reasoning, besides advancing new and valid arguments in support of his own assumption; but his attempts in the former direction lack both depth and thoroughness, while the new features which he introduces are not of a nature to carry conviction.

First of all, Bugge says (p. 21) that according to Möller the second combat is not mentioned at all in the Episode. This is incorrect, for that scholar (p. 68) interprets lines 1142-1144¹ as expressly stating that Finn did not oppose the wish of his followers to renew the feud, i. e. that he actually renewed it. Such a cursory mention was sufficient in an epic song when the event alluded to was familiar to everybody. That the pronouns *he* and *him* in lines 1142 and 1143 refer to Hengest and not to Finn (Bugge 32) has already been pointed out by me in another article (M. L. NOTES, I. p. 91) where at the same time I demonstrated that this very circumstance confirms Möller's assumption that Hengest lost his life in the castle of Finn.

Bugge next asserts (p. 21) that the words *heafogeong cyning* in the Fragment cannot mean Hengest, because in the Episode (1085) he is called *þeodnes þegn*. B. might here also have mentioned *þeodenlease* (Ep. 1103). Both these terms have reference to the day on which Hnæf was killed—the one to the time at which the combat was still raging and the other to the time immediately after the combat, when the treaty was being concluded—and, as Möller points out, it is perfectly natural that just then the thought of the king's death should have been uppermost in all minds, even though another had immediately succeeded him in the command of the forces. The word *þegn* in this connection cannot mean a mere follower

¹ Wilcker's edition of Grein's Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Poesie, Vol. I.

or vassal; Hengest must have been equal, if not superior, in rank to *Sigeferð*, the prince of the *Secgan*, that appears from the manner in which he is mentioned in *Frägm. 19* and from the fact that he is, after Hnæf's death, the acknowledged head of the allies. On the expedition against Finn, Hengest, although perhaps as high-born and powerful as Hnæf, the commander-in-chief, was yet in a certain sense, for the time being, subordinate to the latter and hence might well have been called a *þegn*; by his subsequent accession to the leadership he became *eo ipso* the *cyning*, even if such had not been his rank and title before. The word *cyning* often means nothing but a leader, a commander; King Aelfred in his translation of Orosius applies it to consuls, proconsuls, praetors, tribunes and, in one instance, even to a centurion (Orosius, ed. Sweet, p. 192). On the other hand, Hnæf is mentioned in *Widsið* (29) and must have ruled over the Hocings a good many years; consequently he cannot have been *heafogeong* at the time of his death.

As to lines 41 and 42 of the Fragment (Bugge, p. 21) it must be borne in mind that Hengest's followers could not possibly be grateful to *him* for *swetne medo*, for the simple reason that they had not as yet received any from him. Before they left their country, Hnæf had provided for all their wants, and after his death it was Finn, not Hengest, who gave them *hringas* and *sinegestreona*, and no doubt also *beor* and *meodu* (Ep. 1089 ff.).

One of Möller's weightiest arguments (p. 95) is that according to Ep. 1087 the term *eotenas* signifies the party of Hnæf, not the Frisians, and that consequently the former were the assailants in the first combat (see Ep. 1071 f.). This proposition must seem self-evident to anyone who reads the passages in question; yet Bugge, without giving any reasons whatever, asserts (p. 37) that the *hie* in line 1085 must refer to the "Danes," although he is forced to acknowledge that the same pronoun in the line immediately preceding means the Frisians. And upon such an arbitrary interpretation of a passage which is grammatically as well as logically faultless, Bugge founds his assumption that *eotenas* meant the Frisians.

Other equally strong points in Möller's argu-

mentation are simply passed over in silence; I will only mention Ep. 1068 (Möller, p. 69) and *Frägm. 19* (M. p. 66).

Bugge's position with reference to the whole question is evidently determined by lines 1142-1144 which he translates as follows (p. 32): "Thus Hengest did not refuse to declare himself a vassal (of Finn) when Hun laid Lafing, the gleaming weapon, the best of swords, upon his lap"—that is, Hengest chose this line of action in order to afterwards introduce himself into Finn's castle under pretence of bringing him gifts or tribute, but in reality for the purpose of taking vengeance upon the unsuspecting King by surprising and killing him in the night. It would be difficult to conceive anything more forced and improbable than this interpretation. In the first place, such far-reaching calculation, such cunning treachery are foreign to the character of a brave warrior like Hengest; it does not even appear *why* he should have chosen such a roundabout way of revenging himself when he might just as well have accomplished his purpose in honest warfare, after returning home and securing re-inforcements. Furthermore we know from Ep. 1080 ff. that in the combat in which Hnæf was killed, Finn lost all his men except a few and, being unable to hold his own against Hengest, had to offer terms of a nature very humiliating to himself; how then could he, under such circumstances, invite Hengest to become his vassal? It would have been the height of absurdity.—Bugge assumes that Hun laid the sword upon Hengest's lap. Hun is not mentioned anywhere in the Episode or in the Fragment; but even supposing that the *Hætware* were allied with the Frisians, as afterwards in the war with Hygelac, and that Hun was their king at the time when the events of the Finn-saga transpired, it would still be a mystery how he came to act the part which Bugge assigns to him. When a noble wanted to become the vassal of some king or prince, the latter handed to him his sword in person; very likely he only held it out to him while the noble laid his hand upon the hilt and swore the oath of allegiance. In receiving a man of Hengest's rank and power into vassalage, Finn would surely have performed the customary ceremony himself, without requiring the

services of a third person; and even if Hun had handed Finn's sword to Hengest, such an act on his part would have been too unimportant to warrant the mention of his name to the exclusion of that of Finn. The expression *bearm dyde* also opposes Bugge's theory; the act of presenting a man with a sword did not by any means constitute him the vassal of the donor, it had not, so far as I know, any symbolical significance at all.

Beside these internal difficulties, Bugge's theory creates a host of others in the surrounding text, and the author vainly endeavors to explain them away by means of as many extravagant and hazardous conjectures; it is hard to tell which of the two is worse, the evil or the remedy. Thus Bugge says (p. 30 f.) that the word *swa* (1142) logically refers to line 1135 (which he translates by "those who always watch the hall") and that this line must originally have followed 1141. In other words, he would have us believe that some scribe, in copying a *Béowulf*-manuscript, accidentally skipped 1136-1141 and then, after writing exactly one metrical line, returned to the place where he left off without afterwards noticing his mistake when he again came to the line which he had already copied. Such an assumption would be plausible only if the original manuscript had been divided into metrical lines and if the last words of 1134 and 1141 had happened to be the same; and even then we should be at a loss to explain how the scribe came to return to 1136.

Bugge's peculiar interpretation of 1141 is based upon his supposition that *etenes* meant the Frisians (see above); he inserts the word *mid* (p. 31) because he needs it for his purposes, although there is no call for any addition; he connects *inne* logically with the first half of the verse, although it gives much better sense if taken with *gemunde* to which, besides, it belongs metrically.

Again, the words *swylice* (1146) and *grimme grípe* (1148) are to refer to Hnaef's death, 75 lines back! This is indeed far-fetched, literally and metaphorically. I need not repeat what I have said about this point before (M. L. NOTES I. p. 91).

Bugge assumes that Hengest obtained leave from his new liege-lord to go home, and that he

afterwards returned to carry out his vengeance. This proposition is expressed in a very singular manner (p. 36): "Hengest was the leader of the party who came to Frysland in order, as they pretended, to bring Finn the tribute of his vassal Hengest." Now if Hengest had been living at that time, he would necessarily have taken a prominent part in the final catastrophe of the Finnsaga; according to the spirit of Old Teutonic epic poetry we should even expect that he would slay Finn with his own hand; but not the slightest allusion is made to him after line 1144. It seems impossible to me that the poet, in his account of the closing events of the Finnsaga, should have purposely omitted Hengest's name, simply because "he thought it *self-evident* that H. was the leader of that expedition" (Bugge 37).

The exclusive mention of *Guðlaf* and *Oslaf* in connection with Finn's death, Bugge tries to explain by an act of disobedience on their part in prematurely giving vent to their animosity, contrary to Hengest's orders. But surely they could not have been more eager for revenge than Hengest himself; besides, the above assumption cannot be reconciled with the relations which existed between the Teutonic princes and their followers and with the implicit subordination to which the latter were accustomed.

The *Hrolfsaga* which Bugge adduces (p. 35) in support of his interpretation of Ep. 1142 ff. has nothing whatever in common with the Finnsaga. It is needless to demonstrate this. Nor could Hengest, even if Bugge's theory of his vassalage and treachery were correct, in any respect be likened to *Hjorvarðr*; for the latter becomes Hrolf's vassal in good faith, he even marries the king's sister and it is she who persuades him to kill his liege-lord, her own brother. The analogous points which Bugge discovers in the two sagas (p. 24) are too commonplace to establish any relationship between them; the description of the hall-combat in the *Nibelungenlied*, for instance, contains details exactly corresponding with those quoted by Bugge.

I have explained in the above why I consider Bugge's interpretation of Ep. 1142 ff. and his opposition to Möller a failure. Möller's theory concerning the relation of the Fragment

to the Episode stands unshaken; yet it may not be amiss to add, for the sake of completeness, another argument in support of it.

Let us suppose for a moment that the *heapo-geongz cyninz*, Frigm. 2, is Hnaef and that the latter, accordingly, is defending himself, with his force of sixty men, in a hall against the Frisians. Now we know that in a fight like that, where only a few men were engaged at a time—probably not more than one at each door—the king never went forward first; on the contrary, he generally survives all his followers. Thus in the Nibelungenlied Gunther and Hagen are the last to die. In our Fragment *Sigeferð* and *Eaha, Ordlaſ* and *Guðlaſ* occupy the doors and *Hengest* follows them; Hnaef is not mentioned at all. We naturally expect that all these men and at least the majority of the remaining fifty-five will fall before Hnaef; yet we find that after Hnaef's death Hengest is still living and has a body of men strong enough to force Finn to an ignominious treaty. This is evidently inconsistent. Besides, the question arises, how could the issue of the combat be so unfavorable to Finn if he was the assailant? It was in his power to suspend hostilities, should matters have assumed a critical aspect, and as he was in his own country, he might easily and quickly have procured re-inforcements. Again, if Finn had broken the *treowe* (Ep. 1072) by surprising Hnaef in the night and killing him and many of his allies and followers, Hengest would on no account have spared him by accepting his terms when it was in his power to avenge the death of his comrades. All these difficulties disappear if we assume with Möller (p. 69) that Hnaef was the aggressor in the first combat and that he opposed Finn in an open battle; his place was then at the head of his army and his death early in the conflict is at once explained. Very likely he had killed Finn's son and was in his turn slain by the father. Hengest was then at liberty to conclude a treaty with Finn, as the latter had acted in self-defense.

We have, then, strong internal evidence that the combat described in the Fragment cannot have been the one in which Hnaef fell and, consequently, cannot have preceded the events related in the Episode. Its proper place is, as I have endeavored to show in the

article above referred to, between Ep. 1141 and 1142.

I may be allowed to add a few remarks on some other points in Bugge's article.

His reading of Frigm. 5 and 6 (p. 22) becomes of course purposeless if, as I assume (M. L. NOTES I, p. 116) the verb *beran* is here used intransitively. See Cosijn, M. L. NOTES II, p. 5.

In Frigm. 20 Bugge proposes (p. 25) *Guðdene Garulf* instead of *Garulf Guðere* and the *Guðdene*, according to him, is *Sigeferð*. But on p. 29 he says himself that the *Secgan*, the tribe of *Sigeferð*, were not Danes proper. Furthermore, it is simply impossible that *Sigeferð* should have warned Garulf, one of his enemies, not to risk his precious life by approaching the doors of the hall; lines 24 and 25 clearly prove that these two warriors did not even know each other and *Sigeferð*'s answer contains a threat which shows anything but a friendly feeling toward the questioner.

The compound *banhelm* (Frgm. 32) means "protector of the bones, or body," analogous to *banloca* (Beow. 742 and 818) and is in apposition and synonymous with *celod bord* in line 31. I do not understand why Bugge calls it "sinnlos." His reading is *barhelm*=boar-helmet; but the boar on the helmets is always called *eofor* (Beow. 303, 1112) or *swin* (Beow. 1111, 1286, 1453), never, to my knowledge, *bar*; moreover, compounds of *helm* with these words do not occur anywhere. On the contrary, *eoforcumbol* is often used synecdochically for the whole helmet (Elene 76, 259) and the same may probably be said of the simplex *eofor* (Beow. 1112).

The *wund hæleð* (Frgm. 45) is in Bugge's opinion (p. 28) a "Dane" and the *folces hyrde* (48) Hnaef. The latter, he says, did not necessarily see everything that happened, "for the place where he stood is not mentioned at all." Logic is evidently not Bugge's forte. No matter in what part of the hall Hnaef was, he must have been able to see for himself what happened at the different doors, and we may safely assume that he watched the proceedings with the greatest attention. The *folces hyrde* is apparently not an eye-witness of the combat at all.

In speaking of the forms *eotena*, *eotenum* in

the Episode, Bugge is forced to acknowledge that "they seem to belong to *eotenas*, giants" (p. 37); but he denies the mythological origin of the Finnsaga and his reason is "eben weil mir die sage nicht mythisch scheint." It is to be regretted that he does not back his view with actual proofs; subjective impressions of course go for nothing. He does not state whether he also questions the relationship of the Finnsaga to the Hilde- and Gudrunasgas, although this point is of the greatest importance for the interpretation of both the Episode and the Fragment.

HUGO SCHILLING.

Wittenberg College.

A WORD OF EXPLANATION.

Prof. Brandt, NOTES ii. 132, has evidently misapprehended the animus of my passing remark, NOTES ii. 63.

On reading Bradley's *Academy* review of the *History of the German Language* (by Strong and Meyer), in Tübingen last summer, I deemed it somewhat of a joke that the editors should have made such a bad bungle as to mislead a scholar of Bradley's acuteness. And the joke seemed to repeat itself in Prof. Brandt's review of the same book. Why should so thorough-going a student of Old German as Prof. Brandt be at fault over the Germanic preterites, unless indeed he had been misled by the hap-hazard assertion of a couple of careless writers.

But now it appears that Prof. Brandt takes my allusion *au grand sérieux* and suspects me of twitting him with ignorance on a cardinal point of Germanic grammar. I am very sorry for this, and promise henceforth to be always serious.

It appears, furthermore, that my language was improper in calling *snera, sera, rera* "Noreen's reduplication-preterites." Does Prof. Brandt really believe that I look upon Noreen as the *Entdecker, Erfinder* of these preterites? My faulty style sprang from a desire to be concise. I trusted to the reader to expand my abbreviation into something like this: "The reduplication-preterites treated by Noreen in his Grammar, § 421."

The readers of NORES will be grateful to me

for having—unintentionally—provoked Prof. Brandt to a fuller treatment of the reduplication-preterites than that previously given by him. We shall all profit by his scholarship. But at one point he must suffer me to put in an objection. He says: "I have heard of the Sigmatic aorist, but never of an *s*-perfect or *s*-preterite." But some of us have! If Prof. Brandt will only turn to Windisch, *Kurzgefasste Altirische Grammatik*, § 269, 274, he will find a special section devoted to forms like *gabim* 'capio,' *ro gabus* 'cepi,' and labeled "*s*-praeteritum." Then, § 303, the following statement: "In der späteren Sprache werden die alten Perfecta vielfach nach Analogie des *s*-praeteriti umgestaltet oder durch dasselbe ersetzt: *tanacus*, ich kam ... So auch *bebais* er starb für altirisch *bebe*, etc., etc." Again, § 338, Windisch treats of the *s*-preterite in deponent form, for example, *labrur* 'loquor,' *ro labrasur* 'locutus sum.'

My knowledge of Celtic is insufficient to warrant me in either attacking or defending Windisch's terminology. Possibly he may regard his *s*-preterite as a sigmatic aorist; I do not know. But is it surprising that Kuno Meyer, a pupil of Windisch, should speak of a perfect in *s*?

Prof. Brandt thinks that in criticising Noreen's § 76,3 and proposing its transfer to § 55, I did Noreen an injustice. Scarcely. I was chiefly concerned in clearing up a confusion of two phenomena alike in appearance but due to different causes. Noreen's statement tripped me, when I first met it, and I wished to prevent it from tripping others. I thought and still think that the proper place for treating *sokkenn* is that paragraph which speaks of the *u>o* by reason of an *-o* in the following syllable. If this change is found discussed anywhere else than § 55, I shall be pleased to learn it. Noreen could have mentioned *sokkenn* there as the specific Norse operation of a Germanic law, even if the chapter be labeled "Einleitendes über die Urgermanischen Sonanten." Perhaps it would have been still better, if Noreen had composed a separate section, to be entitled "Spuren urgermanischer Gesetze bei den Sonanten," making it the counterpart to his present chapter iv. p. 104, on such traces in the consonants.

In one or two respects my review of Noreen now appears to me questionable. It is not correct to say that *kolloðn* is a "carrying-back" of the *u*-umlaut. That is, the *u*-in the ultimate. I now see, from § 113. 1, that Noreen regards *kolloðu* < **kalluðn* < *kallððu*. That is, the *kall-* is umlauted to *koll-* by the *u*(=ð) of the penult.

Will any one help to a better understanding of the imperative singular in Germanic? I cannot be quite certain from Sievers, § 131, whether he accepts Paul's argumentation, *Beiträge* vi. 127, that *-e* must have survived in Germanic. His wording puzzles me. In § 130 he says "Indog. (und noch germ.) *a*, *o* in ultima," in § 131 "das ursprünglich auslautende *-e*." Is the "ursprünglich" in § 131 the same as the "indog. (noch germ.)", of § 130? If the *-e* was retained in Germanic, then the imperative singular of the verb 'to choose' in Icelandic may (must?) have been at one time **valeje*. Can we derive the actual *vel* from this through an unbroken chain of phonetic evolution, or has false analogy been at work? According to Sievers § 45, 8/ **valeje* should go over to **valje* (Gothic **nazejo* > *nazjo*). What was then the next step? Was the *-e* apocopated, **valj-* > going over to **vali* > **veli* > **vele*? If so, we must account for *vel* by Noreen § 135, and concede that Icelandic apocope is later than *i*-umlaut. Or was **valje* converted to **vale* by a general Germanic law that *j* after a short stem disappears before palatal vowels. Then we should get **vale*, (**val* § 135), and not an umlauted *vel*.

I freely admit that I am at a loss, and hope that the point may be treated hereafter by Paul with his peculiar philosophic insight. His explanations, *Beiträge* VI, 161, 170, 173, are to me the least satisfactory portions of that memorable essay. They do not enable me to adjust Germanic umlaut (Paul's *-ij*, versus Sievers's *-ej*) and the conversion *s* > *z* > *r*. The rule of syncope *seems* to require the imperative singular to have stem-accent. If so, why do we get *nere*, instead of **nese*. Meanwhile I may ask the reader to add these remarks to my previous ones upon Noreen, § 135 and § 453.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

OTHER NOTES ON THE *Andreas*.

From some of the *dicta* recorded by Bright in the last issue of 'Modern Language Notes' (Vol. II, 160—164), I am inclined to dissent. I shall endeavor, however, to give some reasons for disagreeing. *Fæced* l. 301, *est* l. 483, *brim stæðo* l. 499, and *medium* l. 1377, I had given up before, *behildenan* l. 1089, since the reception of Wülker's edition. For my views about l. 855 I refer to the forthcoming number of the 'American Journal of Philology.'

145. For MS. *wæs* Bright suggests *pæs*. The emendation *hwæs*, made by Thorpe and adopted by all the editors, I still adhere to. Initial *h* is several times missing in this poem, cf. *lyt* l. 6, *we is* l. 323 and here. Other letters are occasionally left out: *hettend* for *hettend* l. 31, *heorudeorige* for *heorudreorige* l. 996, etc. etc. Besides, I agree with Zupitza in considering *hwæs* interrogative, in thinking that we have here a dependent interrogative clause. Bright fails to explain how *pæs* is to be taken and to support his emendation with other like examples of *pæs* with this use.

64. But, if *pæs* were the correct reading, how would that help *seoðað* l. 64? As we see below, *ð* not *p* is found in the Ms. Before we dismiss Baskerville's note so hastily, let us consider the note for his second edition of *Andreas*. MS. *seoðað* Gm. changed to *seowað* which was adopted by K. and Gr. Gr. ² (*Germania* X) went back to the MS. reading. Gm. says, "searonet *seovað*=rete dolosum consuunt . . . I have emended according to B. 8c6 (B. 406 it should read), although *seoðað*=coquunt might be used with reference to the forging of fetters. But the mistake of writing *p* for *v* in Anglo-Saxon is conceivable." Wülker answers this by saying that not *p*, but *ð* occurs here and adds, "but even with *seowað* little is gained; for in B. 406 *searonet* and *seowed* have an entirely different meaning='the (by the smith's craft) woven corselet.' The use of this verb with *searonet* in the sense suggested by Grimm does not occur. Grein derives *seoðað* from *seoðan*=coquere. In B. 190, 1993 this word is used in a different sense. On the other hand Gu. 1046, 1123, 1236 it signifies 'to vex, torture' (quälen), a meaning near akin to 'boil' (sieden). The passages in Beowulf signify 'to be excited over, brood, pine,' with *cearn* as

object both times. Grein, perceiving that this meaning would not suit here, suggested *moliri?* but added *seovað, seoviað?*"

W. retains *seovað*, but derives it from *seðan*, which with its compounds *aseðan* and *geseðan* occurs frequently: Dan. 654; Cri. 243; El. 582; Ps. 93, 4; Ps. 118, 160; further, Bed. 41, 8; Boeth. (Fox's edition) p. 20; Aelfr. Hom. (Thorpe's edition) II, 130, 11; Aelfr. Gram. (Zupitza's edition) p. 226, 11; Wright's Gloss. (Wülker's edition) 208, 5; 208, 23; 214, 30; 238, 40; 340, 17." This word signifies 'to verify, affirm, make true, fulfill, etc.' To assume a further development of meaning—'to carry into effect, prepare' (ausführen, bereiten) would not be too bold a conjecture: 'How for me the strangers prepare spiteful snares (i. e. malicious attacks) and death.' For *searonet* has here most probably the same meaning that *wælnet* usually has." As can easily be seen, Wülker fails to cite a single instance of *seðan* or its compounds with the meaning found in our passage. Furthermore he fails to tell us how ē, i-umlaut of ð (*seðan* from *sðð*), can interchange with *eo*. I adhere to the opinion that *seovað* is derived from *seoðan* = coquere. By comparison with the Icelandic we find that *sjóða* (A.-S. *seoðan*) signifies "to fuse steel and soft iron," a smith's term (cf. Cleasby-Vigfusson's Icelandic Dictionary under *sjóða* I, 2, where several examples are given). Hence it may be conjectured that the Old-English, too, used this word in the same sense, as Grimm suggested. Again, *coquo vel coco ic seoðe* is found in Aelfr. Gram., p. 175, and *coquo* from Quintilian's time was regularly used figuratively, in much the same sense as *concoct* is now. Acquainted with Latin as the Old-English were, they would naturally, it is easy to suppose, translate coquere, figuratively as well as literally, by *seoðan*. Further, that *seoðan* was used to express mental action we have abundant proof both in the Icelandic and in the Old-English. For the latter compare the examples quoted above; and for the former see "Cleasby-Vigfusson, etc.," as quoted above, II, where *sjóða* signifies "to brood over, delay." "To devise, prepare" follows naturally I think from these meanings.

Why *landes ne* l. 303, "metrically as it would

seem, is to be eliminated," and why l. 489 is too short by one syllable (similar remarks are made with reference to ll. 1443, 1700), I confess I do not understand. Just in what way Bright would make syllables affect the metre of these lines I fail to see.

819. *berede*.—Bright says: "Baskerville's note is a failure," etc. Against this I will place Wülker's note on this word. "MS. has distinctly *berede*. Also Thorpe, Gm. K. and Gr. substitute (*setzen*) without remark *herede*, most probably on account of the alliteration. Baskerville retains the reading of the MS. I, too, prefer to retain *berede*, however near the above change may lie. *Berian*= 'to make known, manifest' (darlegen, an den Tag legen) is found Dan. 142. Since this meaning suits here admirably, there is no ground for change. B. understands this passage just so and translates 'made known.'"

1585. *heofon swaðrode*. "Baskerville has no argument in favor of *heofon*, etc." I shall give up my translation of *heofon*, but retain the word. Wülker goes further, retaining *heofon* 393, 1508, 1585. There is no reason, as he says, to change on account of the alliteration, since irregular (ungenaue) verses occur so frequently in *Andreas*. In all these places *heofon* is perfectly distinct in the MS. *heofon geotende* occurs twice in A.-S. poetry and *gifen geotende* only once.

In a later issue of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, I hope to discuss some other words and passages in *Andreas*. These, however, will suffice for the present.

W. M. BASKERVILL.
Vanderbilt University.

PROF. BASKERVILL'S NOTES.

Since the form of statement employed by Prof. Baskerville clearly invites a reply to some points of his communication, indulgence will perhaps not be withheld from a few additional remarks, of the utmost brevity, on questions already sufficiently discussed.

In proposing the emendation of line 145, I had in mind, as was indicated, the opinion which the construction had called forth from Lohmann as against Zupitza, and therefore

ventured the suggestion which releases the passage from the controversy. Not having deemed it necessary to say that *pæs* makes the subordinate clause purely relative, I am now willing, with the correction of this serious omission, to leave the reader to his own choice in the matter. I would only add that for those who may prefer to read *hwæs* a passage like the following, *ācle bidað hwæt him æfter dædum dēman wille līfes tō lēane*, Juliana, ll. 706 f. will possibly not be unwelcome, while Judith, ll. 183 f., *ac him ne ðe god lengran līfes*, enables us to cancel "attraction" in Grein's Gloss. II p. 114, l. 1. Moreover, in connection with Prof. Baskerville's illustrations of the not infrequent omission of a letter in the manuscript, it will be observed that the retention of *heorudeorize* (l. 996) in his text, and that, too, in despite of the occurrence of the correct form some lines later in the poem and the correction of the preceding editors, does not reveal that harmony of parts that we like to associate with notions of an editor's doctrine.

In the note on line 64, undue stress is laid on Prof. Würker's assurance that "ð not þ is found in the MS.," for in dealing with a text that has evidently been copied and recopied, who can tell how often, before reaching its present state, there is certainly no violence in thinking of an arbitrary confusion of the signs ð and þ, and assuming the transmission: ð < þ < w. On the other hand Prof. Baskerville has properly rejected Prof. Würker's *séoðað < séðan* [sóð verus]. The question is, therefore, reduced to a choice between the two remaining readings that have been variously upheld by the editors. Prof. Baskerville's details in favor of one of these will be found interesting; I, however, hold to the opposed view, and without making a formal defense would merely say that for me the collocation in Beowulf, *searonet séowan*, is definitive. We have but to look at the long lists of parallel expressions in A.-S. poetry, lists that have of late been extended and newly interpreted, to be persuaded that the soundest method of interpretation in this department of writings is that of comparison. If, therefore, *séowan* proves, in an undisputed passage, to be the proper word to use with *searonet*, a probability in favor of the same collocation in

another connection is established that far outweighs such arguments as have been urged for the retention of a scribal blunder, or against a good and effective figure of speech.

Touching the paragraph in which Prof. Baskerville declares himself unable to understand me, I can only say that in my arguments based on the requirements of the metre, I believed to give sufficient references both to show to what theory of verse I adhered, and to obviate the charge of a lack of evidence.

The canon of textual criticism shown by Prof. Würker and adopted by Prof. Baskerville in the case of lines 819 and 1587 is incomprehensible to me, so that I am altogether unfitted to combat it. I cannot, however, resist making the experiment of a simple induction on editors who cherish a mental reservation with respect to the use of alliteration in A.-S. verse:

beorht bēacan godes; brimu swaðredon. B. 570.
mēðe be mæste. Mere sweðerade. An. 465.
widſæð me wæz; wædu swædorodon. An. 533.
lēt Babilone blæd swiðrian. Dan. 683.
ēce and edgeonȝ æfre ne sweðrað. Ph. 608.
siððan Heremōdes hild sweðrode. B. 902.
scán scir-wered, scadu sweðredon. Guth. 1262.
scire scínan. Sceadu sweðerodon. An. 838.

Apply now the 'rule of three' and obtain the unknown quantity in:

ȝeoc æfter zyrne, [x]eofon swaðrode. An. 1587.

In the last number of the 'American Journal of Philology' (vol. 8, p. 95), Prof. Baskerville has given us a new reading for the passage ll. 856 f., as follows:

*in pam cēole wæs cyninga wuldor:
 waldend weorðode ic, his word oncnēow,
 þēh hé his mægwltie bemiðen hæfde.*

It were interesting to know how he would have us scan the second verse.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

*MODERN FRENCH PHONETICS:
apropos of Whitney's French Grammar.*

A grammar from the pen of this eminent scholar and veteran grammarian could not but be excellent, and we greet this, his latest book, with all the more pleasure as, hitherto, we have felt the need of a thoroughly practical French grammar, which, at the same time, should include the first steps of a scientific study of the language. The time devoted to Modern Languages in our schools and colleges is so short that, unless imparted throughout the course, the science of language will never find a place in the curriculum. "The design had in view in this book," says the author in his preface, "has been to furnish a grammar which should combine the advantages of practice and theory in a higher degree than others now existing. To this end, the most important facts of the language have been grouped and arranged in a series of Lessons, in an order suggested by practical convenience, each lesson being accompanied by sufficient Exercises." This forms the essential feature of the First or Practical part of the grammar, and is certainly a successful innovation in the art of grammar-making for the school-room. Nothing can be drier or more repugnant to young learners than a scientific grammar in which all the niceties of the language are discussed at length and comparisons of the various cognate families and groups instituted in a manner to confuse rather than instruct. It is only after the mastery of the language and only when one turns to the study of the language as language that such a book can be inviting. But when practical lessons are accompanied by judicious and well arranged scientific facts showing the historical development of the language, then the desire for further knowledge is awakened without detriment to the acquirement of that practical knowledge necessary for conversation. Although Professor Whitney has been guided to a certain extent by the "Conversation-Grammar" of Otto, yet the advance is so great that the careful scholar would hardly recognize it.

The Second Part "gives a more penetrating view of the usages of the language, especially of its syntactical usages. The framework of

the Lessons, which could only embarrass such a presentation, is discarded in it." Here we have as thorough a treatment of French syntax as the ordinary student will ever need. The specialist will find a complete treatment of the subject in purely scientific grammars and by private study. This second part also contains "a series of selected phrases from French authors of repute, exemplifying most of the usages of which it is the duty of a grammar to take note." These are accompanied by appropriate English exercises for translating into French, so that there is no lack of material for the thorough mastery of French, either spoken or written, since the exercises in French and English can form the basis of conversations. Attention is constantly directed to the correspondences between the French and Latin, thus facilitating the comparative study of the language, as far as that may be desirable.

When we begin the study of a foreign language the first difficulty which we have to encounter is the pronunciation. Hence the first requisite is a thorough and complete knowledge of its sounds, otherwise it will ever remain a dead language to us. We may be able to read and write it correctly, but we shall never be able to speak or understand it. An indifferent or careless pronunciation is really worse than none at all. For it is very difficult to unlearn what has been wrongly learned and then relearn it aright. This is especially the case with a foreign language, even if we go to the country where it is spoken in order to correct a false pronunciation. Therefore too much care cannot be taken with beginners, that they may not fall into the usual school pronunciation which a native of the country would not be able to understand, nor would the scholar himself understand the language, if he were to hear it correctly spoken. "There is always a musical flow to every language, which a foreigner rarely acquires without a long residence in the country, and even then he speaks with an accent, as it is called." This no teacher can be expected to impart, but every teacher is expected to give his scholars a correct idea of the sounds of the language taught (cf. Storm, *Englische Philologie*). The average grammar for learning foreign languages either omits all treatment of

pronunciation or treats it so falsely that more harm than good is done. But since the study of Phonetics has come to the foreground, grammarians have been forced to pay more attention to this subject, and it is beginning to receive due consideration. Professor Whitney, without attempting an exhaustive treatment of this subject, which would have been foreign to the plan of his book, has given some very practical hints that will be of great aid to the teacher. There is an excellent opportunity for some one to write an elementary book on Phonetics for class use, as the subject, though very important, is much neglected. A translation, or adaptation, of Vietor's Elements of Phonetics, for school use in America, would be very acceptable to teachers.

The very first statement made by Professor Whitney that "there is no strongly-marked distinction of long and short vowels in French, such as there is in English (and German)" proves conclusively the need of a text-book on Phonetics for school use. No one will doubt the correctness of the statement, and yet to those who have not paid especial attention to the subject it is completely misleading. There is in French a clear and finely-marked distinction between long and short vowels and the excellent speaker proves his superiority by its exact observation. But that distinction is not as great, not as striking to the unpracticed ear, as in English or German.

All syllables appear short in conversation, yet, if the ear is attentive, it will perceive a quantitative distinction observed by a careful speaker who has properly trained organs. Even early French writers on the subject have maintained that there is no difference of quantity in the language, but it is to be feared that they have taken differences of quality for differences of quantity. For in the *o-fermé* of *hôte* and the *o-ouvert* of *hotte* there is a distinction independent of quantity, while the *a* of *pâle* and the *a* of *paraitre* differ only in quantity. Compare also *cours* (long) vs. *court* (short), *dîme* (long) vs. *rime* (short), *bûche* (long) vs. *ruche* (short), *croûte* (long) vs. *doute* (short). The quantity in French seems to depend on the tonic accent, and a syllable becomes demi-short when it loses this accent. But this is also a principle of the English

language. Compare Professor Whitney in the Proceedings of the American Philological Association for July 1885, p. xxv. All languages are subject to the same law, but not in the same degree as the English. This criterion loses some of its force when we remember that there is a difference of opinion about the place of the accent in French; the English phoneticians claiming for it the first syllable of the word, and the Germans and Skandinavians the last. Compare Storm, *Englische Philologie*, p. 77 ff., and Sweet, *Handbook of Phonetics*, p. 126. Position also makes all the difference in the world. *Notre, votre* are short, but when they are final they become long. Thurot (*De la Prononciation Française*) gives the following as the principal rules for long vowels:

- (1) The vowels *e* (*ai, oi*), *i* (*au*), *eu*, *ou*, followed by *e-feminin* are long.
- (2) Vowels and diphthongs resulting from two vowels primitively separated by a consonant are long. This quantity is especially marked when final, in the tonic penult, and in the forms in which this penult becomes atonic.
- (3) Vowels or diphthongs before *s-mute* are long, e. g. *est*.
- (4) Vowels followed by soft *s* are almost long as tonics and often as atonics.
- (5) Every vowel is long before double *r* (*nourrir, barrer* etc.).
- (6) The vowel of the nasal sounds is uncertain: it is sometimes long and sometimes short. Every syllable terminated by an *m* or an *n* not doubled, before another consonant, is long by nature, *feindre, teindre* are trochees; *bonî* is a spondee; *endormir, temporal*, are dactyles.
- (7) *Au, eu, ou*, coming from *al, el, il, ol, ul*, were generally long, not always.
- (8) Every vowel is short before *x*, before *s* pronounced, and followed by another consonant, before *ct, ps, pt, lt*, (these are *mots savants*). (cf. Sweet, I. c. pp. 59, 60; Ellis, E. E. P. 518).

We have just called attention to the quality of vowels as forming a great distinction in the pronunciation of French. It is well known that the English vowels are mostly open (Sweet's wide). The quality of closeness (Sweet's narrowness) in all English vowels is uncertain (cf. Sweet's *Handbook of Phonetics*

p. 110). But the French has quite the opposite tendency. The open or wide vowels are few, there is an "absence of diphthongs (which are represented by consonant-combinations), and the peculiar gutturo-nasal vowels—everything directly opposed to English." *Ibid.* p. 122. In consequence of this direct opposition in the spirit of the two languages, French pronunciation needs attentive study and long practice in the midst of well educated French people in order to acquire that pure intonation and musical flow so much admired in a good speaker; otherwise difficulty will be experienced in pronouncing the simple and compound vowels *ai*, *ay*, *ei*, *ey*, *e-mute*, *e-fermé*, *e-ouvert*, *eu*, *o*. Without a certain amount of practice, a stranger will never pronounce *e-mute* so as not to be readily detected. The *e-fermé* and the *e-ouvert* are as difficult, and *eu* and *o* form as many shades of sounds as *ai*, *ay*, *ei*, *ey*. *je veux*, *lieu*, *feudataire*, *have* *eu-fermé*; *fleur*, *meuble* etc. *eu-ouvert*; *meubler*, *peuplade*, *eu-mid-ouvert*; in *heureux* *peureux* the first syllable has the *eu* almost *fermé*. The vowel *o* demands minute study to distinguish between the sound of *o-fermé* as in *duo*, *trio*, *chose* etc. and of *o-ouvert* in *col*, *sol*, *mol*, etc. There is an infinity of sounds and these shades like the semi-tones in music, ought to be neither too low nor too high. But finding the exact shade of sound is not the only difficulty met with. "There are certain sounds, open or close, which beginners cannot render when they come before certain weak consonants," cf. *globe*, *probe*, *robe*,—*code*, *methode*, *mode*, where the *o* is very open, unless the *tenuis* be substituted for the *media* they are generally pronounced close. The sounds *e*, *eu*, *o*, when open are very open, as *bel*, *seul*, *mol*. In *Il était alors au faite des grandeurs* there are five open sounds, and when properly pronounced they give grace to the sentence; but when given the close sound the delicate ear is shocked. And the close sounds in *épaule*, *autre*, *rose*, *trop*, *heureux*, would be insupportable if pronounced open. The *i* also, whose sound should always be a very sharp and close vowel in French, is pronounced open and long by most English-speaking people. The word *ville* is pronounced like *veal*, *fil*, like *feel* Ital. *virtu*, like *veer-oo*. (Comp.

Storm, l. c. p. 13, and Ellis, *ibid.* 105). The scholar needs to have his attention constantly called to these facts.

The difficulty which the English have to contend with is the vowels of all foreign languages. Hence too much pains cannot be taken in the very beginning. Nor can too much stress be placed upon phonetics, not only in the study of a foreign language but also of our own; it should form a part of the regular curriculum in the common schools and even precede the English grammar, as sounds are acquired by young people with greater ease than by older people.

Another peculiarity of the English pronunciation is the want of labialisation or rounding, which is indicated by the open clear sound noticed above. Sweet calls it the absence of *lip-pouting*. It is really the failure to protrude the lips when forming the vowels. The peculiar *clang*-character (if I may be allowed this expression) of the English vocalism rests essentially upon the small participation of the lips in the formation of sounds (it being a rule of etiquette in England to move the lips as little as possible in speaking), says Sievers. It is evident from the foregoing that in learning French we should guard against the openness of the English vowels. For though the *o* of *sol*, *robe*, *noce*, etc., is open and short, that of *not*, *dot*, *rob*, *body* is much opener, opener even than that of the German *Dotter*, etc.

The presentation of the different French vowels by Professor Whitney is excellent, and embodies the latest researches. The mute or silent *e* will ever give trouble, as it is an un-English sound (cf. Sweet, *ibid.* p. 26, § 71). It changes according to its position, and requires special study and practice to master all its shades, from complete silence as in *acheter*, to its very distinct *eu*-sound in expressions like *de tels cheveux*, or in words in *ress.*, as *ressac*, or in *cresson*, *besson*, where it may have the sound of *e-ouvert moyen*, or nearly close *e*. The phoneticians are not at all agreed upon its value. It is, according to Storm, "distinct from the Norwegian unaccented *e*," which he identifies with the German, (*gerettet*, *gabe*); it is called by French grammarians *moyen-ouvert*, and its sound is nearly *eu-moyen*, being opener than *eu* in *jeu*.

and less open than *eu* in *seul*. Professor Whitney's *hurt* and *hut*, though not exact, come as near to it, perhaps, as any English sound. When final it is not quite like the English *the* before a consonant, but that is approximately the sound and will serve as a guide to learners. The whole treatment of this letter is recommended to the careful study of teachers, especially the remark on the absence of the vanishing sound of "long *e*," with which not only our "long *a*," but nearly every English vowel not immediately followed by another, usually ends.

The French *i* is higher than the English which is "slightly lower than in other languages, verging towards (*e*). In French it is often very high, amounting almost to a consonant (cf. Sweet 1. c. p. 27, 123)." We can observe this when foreigners pronounce our word *pity* which sounds to us like *pee-tee*. Its sound is the most delicate and sharp of all the vowels. It is the close *i*, Sweet's high-front-narrow, while the English *i* is the high-broad-wide, or open; hence the difficulty in giving it its proper sound, and one must guard against pronouncing it like our *veal, feel*, etc. Our *i* in *machine, pique*, as pronounced by the most careful speakers, has the correct sound. A careful distinction has been made between the *o-fermé*, as in *chapeau, beau*, etc., and *o-ouvert* as in *sol, col*, etc., and this cannot be emphasized too much. The ability to make a clear distinction between the close and open French vowel is the Shibboleth of an excellent pronunciation.

The French *u* must be acquired from a good teacher. No description will be able to give a correct idea of its nature. Prof. Whitney's is as successful as any and may serve to guide the learner to the correct pronunciation of this, to English people, very difficult sound. There are various shades of difference to be observed. In French it is like the *i*-high, amounting almost to a consonant (cf. above). Sievers doubts the identity of the German and French *u* (*ü*) and *eu* (*ö*) and suggests the following tabular view as representing the relation of these sounds:

FR. DAN.	GER.
ü	—
ö	ü
—	ö

From this we see that in the German *ü, ö*, the tongue is one degree lower than in *i, e*, while, on the other hand, the other languages, like the French and Scandinavian, possess *ü*- and *ö*-sounds which correspond almost exactly to the unrounded front vowels *i, e*, etc. The *eu* is Sweet's *ə, ɔ, ə* (i. e. mid-front-narrow-round, mid-front-wide-round and low-front-narrow-round) while the English sounds in *fur, hurt, err, bird* etc., is Sweet's *eh* (mid-mixed-wide), *reh* (low-mixed-narrow, and *aeh* (low-mixed-wide), i. e. the English sounds are not rounded. We are here before the same difficulty as in *que, or e* final, which belongs to this same class of sounds. This whole class is difficult to define, and more difficult to acquire and practice. Phoneticians are not yet at one in regard to the value of the different shades of sounds and we can only recommend careful attention to the pronunciation of the educated French.

The nasal vowels are extremely well explained and will repay careful study. They require more care than all the other vowels, as they are sounds entirely foreign to the English language and can be mastered only after long practice.

If the English experience difficulty with the vowels, the Germans are not less troubled with the consonants, while the French struggle with the accent (cf. Storm, *ibid.*, p. 13). But even though the consonants do not offer so great difficulties to the English as the vowels, yet there are a few finer shades of distinction in their pronunciation by different nations to which it is necessary to call attention. The manner in which these sounds may be begun and closed is very variable. We may begin them in the first place with what Ellis calls the *clear glottid* (ɔ) and Sweet the *clear beginning*, where "the vocal chords are in a position for voice, which begins without an introductory *flatus*." During the explosion, however, the air still left in the lungs is thickened by the pressure of the expiratory muscles, and, if the pressure is released in the moment of explosion, or shortly after, the explosion is short and quickly broken. This produces the mute with open larynx now usually heard among the Slavs and Romance nations in the beginning and middle of words, and not rarely by

the Germans. But whenever another breath is allowed to unite with the explosion then a mute with a breathed or gradual beginning, or the aspirated mute, arises (*spiritus lenis*), the North German (*p, t, k*) initial. The clear beginning (our first) might be considered the most natural way and is the most usual one in English, though not in German. Even in English it is not always possible to produce the *pure* clear beginning, especially in rapid and lively conversation where the energy of the speaker tends somewhat to the German beginning, which is "a strong puff of breath often heard in English in emphatic pronunciation." There are many shades of aspiration between the clear beginning and the gradual, or breathed, so that it will often be difficult to decide to just which beginning a certain pronunciation is to be classed. We may consider the *p, t, k* of the Romance nations and the Slavs as an example of the unaspirated or pure beginning, and the *p, t, k* of the English as an example of the slightly aspirated, yet still clear, beginning; while the German (*p, t, k*) will serve to exemplify the third variety. The English received pronunciation of medial (*b, d*) is, however, peculiarly neat and more like the French and Italian in this respect, while the quiet way in which an Englishman says and distinguishes (*too, do*) without any effort puts the upper German to despair.

Aside from these shades of difference shown in the beginning and close of the various consonants, the nature of the English and Continental varieties are slightly different. Take, for instance, the series (*t, d, l, n*) and it is soon evident that "the tip of the tongue for received English is not so advanced towards the teeth and gums as for the Continental sounds." In other words, the English use the so-called cerebrals or cacuminals, while the Continental people employ the pure dentals. The only recognized English dental (by phoneticians) is before the (*r*) in some of the northern dialects of England. A native of Bengal "distinctly recognized his own cerebral *t, d* as true English sounds, and his own dentals, or as he considers them 'soft,' *t, d*, as true French sounds." This distinction, however slight it may be, is readily observed by one who is accustomed to it in his own language,

and is one of those niceties in pronunciation which marks the cultured speaker. "A foreigner would consider our (*t, d, l, n*) *retracted*." These finer distinctions are, however, seldom considered in text-books, or in giving instruction, and yet they are essential to a perfect pronunciation. It is not my intention to discuss the question at length, but only to point out some of the difficulties which beset the learner when attempting to master the pronunciation of a foreign language. One may be able to imitate the sounds pronounced to him by a native and unconsciously acquire an excellent pronunciation; but only he who studies the language in the light which accurate theoretical and practical investigations in the field of phonetics has thrown upon the subject will ever master these sounds so well as to observe the finer distinctions of the different languages. Theoretical study alone is not sufficient; practice, either in the country itself, which is best, or with a thorough teacher conversant with the language, is also necessary. The need of a school of phonetics to educate teachers, not only in foreign languages, but in their own, is making itself more and more felt.

Prof. Whitney's treatment of the consonants is an excellent introduction to their study and far superior to that found in the ordinary text-book. No one could expect a full and complete treatment of the subject here, still all the essential points are clearly and concisely discussed. Every statement is accurate and reliable, which gives additional value to the book in this age when vagaries of opinion seem to be in order. The beginner will find all that he needs for his initiation into French pronunciation, and, having mastered the first steps, will be well prepared for the fuller treatment of the subject under competent (native) teachers.

We find the same care in the grammar proper as in the opening chapter on pronunciation. One instance of concise and accurate statement may be seen in his remarks on the formation of the French future (p. 41 in note c). It will also serve to show how appropriately the formation of the language and comparative grammar may be woven into a practical lesson for beginners. Sometimes, however, the author seems to incline to a less-

authorized usage, as in the plural of the adjective *fatals* (masc.). Littré admits no plural whatever and the best authorities agree with him. *Fatals* is, to be sure, gaining ground and will no doubt one day obtain. I see no benefit to be derived by conforming to the French rule of prefixing the conjunction *que* to the inflection of the subjunctive tenses, nor in making the preposition to the "sign of the infinitive." Such obsolete usages and terms might advantageously be dispensed with, as they are really misleading and help to form wrong impressions which it is almost impossible to correct.

The remarks on the formation of the different parts of the verb (p. 85 ff.) are highly to be commended and will serve to lighten its study very much. This and the chapters on the irregular verbs, on the conjunctive and disjunctive pronouns, on the use of *ce* and *il* with *être*, are extremely clear and excellent. Yet I would recommend the study of *ce* and *il* in Sauveur's "Grammaire Française pour les Anglais" to every teacher, where the subject has received an exhaustive discussion. The delicate points of *que* as predicate receive due attention on p. 122. Whether *je sache* is subjunctive or indicative is one of those disputed points that will never be settled (cf. Am. Journ. of Philol., Vol. I., p. 197).

In the Second Part, the opening chapter shows the relation of the French to the Latin, and this feature is made more prominent throughout the rest of the book. It is intended for more advanced pupils and will form an excellent introduction to the comparative study of the French. The treatment of the subjunctive is thorough and complete, and the examples from the best authors given at the end of each special head serve as models to the English exercises for translation into French.

It would not be a difficult task to find fault with many things in the book, but I have only attempted to call attention to its excellencies and point out in what respect it might have been improved. Naturally one who pays more attention to matter than to the manner in which he presents it will occasionally use expressions that a second reading would have improved. One of these cases we find in the expression "there is had in view." We can,

however, more willingly excuse these defects than erroneous statement.

In conclusion we heartily recommend this new book to all colleagues as a vast improvement on the ordinary school text-book.

SYLVESTER PRIMER.

College of Charleston.

ENGLISH METRE.

Chapters on English Metre, by JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A. London, C. J. Clay & Sons, 1886. viii, 266 pp. 8vo.

An assembly of classical and high-school teachers happened the other day to fall into a discussion about the study of English versification. The sentiment prevailed that with classes in English literature poetry should be read for the sense rather than for the metre. One gentleman waxed bolder. What was the use of poetry, anyhow? Nothing, he assured us, had ever been said in poetry that could not be better said in prose. Now, even a body of schoolmasters feels a little shy when it comes to wiping poetry off the face of the globe, and I am bound to say that the speaker did not carry his audience with him. But such utterances are depressing in many ways. Doubly pleasant is it, therefore, to take up this book of Mayor's, and find an Englishman, a university scholar, a friend and aid to those who would live in the classics, deliberately advocating for schools the study and analysis of English metres. Moreover, he writes this text-book to help the cause. He takes his subject seriously. Your classical man, approaching the vernacular, too often assumes a patronizing and off-duty air, sees all things in Greek, and looks over his spectacles at a bit of native verse with—"Not a bad little choriambic, that!" Such a writer is pretty sure to ignore the work of Germanists. Schipper, in his *Metrik*, has a fair and exhaustive introduction on the factors of English verse; quantity (Kap. V.) fares better than one could reasonably ask. It is therefore surprising to find Dr. Goodell (Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc., 1885) writing on the very foundation of our metres and saying not a word of Schipper, of Rieger, of Scherer, and the rest. Aside from his extravagant claims for quantity (well answered

by Prof. W. D. Whitney, *Proceed.* p. vii.), Dr. Goodell will have very serious difficulties in persuading scholars to accept his scanning of "willow" or "mallow" (in Tennyson's *Brook*) with a 'short' (eighth note) for the first or root syllable, and a 'long' (quarter) for the second syllable, (cf. *Trans.*, p. 85), a proceeding directly defiant of the fundamental law of Germanic verse.

Not so with our author. He recognizes the dignity of English metres as an independent science. I think, however, that he makes a mistake when (p. 3 f.) he sunders the scientific from the historical treatment. Our modern verse is the result of slow development, and is a compromise between Germanic and Romance (cf. ten Brink, *Chaucer's S. und V.*, p. 5). For scientific purposes one must judge any verse of to-day in the double light of its rhythmic and its metric (the terms are easily understood); and to this end one needs often the historic treatment and always the historic sense. This I regard as the main error of Mayor's book,—a criticism which may perhaps be clear from the following considerations.

The author takes "scanning by feet" (p. 7) as the basis of metrical study. Guest's 'sections' are ruled out of court. Dr. Abbott is criticised as too stiff and mechanical in his arrangement of feet (Chap. iii.). J. A. Symonds and his "aesthetic intuitivism" are found wanting in precision and practical value (Chap. iv.). Ellis is lightly criticised; and then the author (vi., vii.) gives his own views. He is more conservative than Ellis, for whom, however, he shows great respect; less stiff than Abbott; far more precise than Symonds. Mayor's chief work is to determine the exact feet of a given verse. To this end he collects and analyzes an admirable array of specimen lines from various poets, principally Shakespeare, Tennyson and Browning. The foot being the unit of metre, we must divide properly every line we meet. When Dr. Abbott treats (cf. p. 45)

To lack | discret | 'on. Come, go | we to | the king | as a case of "extra-metrical syllable" before the pause, this, says Mayor, is a mistake. We must regard the third foot as an anapaest. Again (p. 94), Prof. Bain assumes amphibrach in

There came to | the shore a | poor exile | of Erin. |

Not so, says Mayor; these be anapaests:

There came | to the shore | a poor ex | ile of Er | in.

Again (p. 36), our author rightly condemns Abbott's scanning:

Your breath | first kindled | the de | ad coal | of war. |

Now, looking for ourselves at these three verses, we are struck, in regard to the first two, by the fact that it makes no difference whatever to the real rhythm of the line whether we take Abbott's and Bain's, or Mayor's point of view. The *movement* remains the same. Not so, of course, with the third. We condemn the division of "de-ad," but we need not, with Mayor, query about the feet. Using Ellis' scheme of notation, we "scan:"

Your breath first kindled || the dead coal of war,
1 2 1 2 0 || 0 2 2 0 2

and we quite plainly get the movement and the effect of the measures, though the third measure has no weight at all: the principle of distribution and compensation¹ must solve the problem, along with the allowance for pauses, and for hovering accent ("schwebende Betonung"). The latter term is far better than "spondee," which Mayor so often uses. We have no spondees in English. Whenever a clash occurs between word-accent and verse-accent, as in

The rude *forefathers* of the hamlet sleep,

we have hovering accent, a division of honors, but not a strict spondee. It seems to me that hovering accent nearly always calls out an alteration of *pitch*, as a sort of reconciliation for conflicting claims. Certainly wrong is "trochée" as name for the last foot in (Jason)

About this keel that you are now lacking,

which is a clear case of "wrenched accent," (Mayor, p. 83). Division into feet will never reveal all the secrets of rhythm. Nor does Mayor pay enough attention to the Pause. A good example is on p. 131, when he scans
Holy, | Holy, | Holy, | Lo-rd | God Al | mighty |
Early | in the | morning | our | song shall | rise to | thee—
counting *Lord, our*, as dissyllabic. This will not do. The harmony of a verse depends not simply on a succession of equal measures, but on the mutual dependence and adjustments of these measures. Rhythm, we must never for-

¹ Sievers admits (*Beiträge*, x. 221) the frequent inequality, in time-relations, of our primitive measures; we have clung to this license.

get, means *movement*. Therefore, issue must be taken with Mayor on this point: not the foot, but the verse, the continuous verse, should be assumed as metrical unit.

This assumption of the verse as unit—which does not imply rejection of the measure or foot as a factor in metre—is necessary for one who would get at the rhythm of poetry. "Mit den Strichen für Länge und den Haken für Kürze," says Schmidt in different application, "ist aber doch wahrlich kein Rhythmus gefunden, und ohne Rhythmus keine Poesie!" One feels that the demands of Symonds for a more elastic treatment of metre have their good reasons. Add the artificial and fortuitous character of much of this "scanning by feet." Our author frankly tells us that in order to determine what feet compose a verse, one must often run over half-a-dozen lines, catch the prevailing measure, and then apply it verse by verse. This breaks down in lyric poetry. Despite his lore about the monosyllabic initial foot, Mayor confesses that often one metre is just as applicable as another. The decision is an appeal to the majority of verses. Take Tennyson's 'Lucknow' (p. 116). What is its metre? The ordinary reader answers, a spirited six-stress verse in prevailing triple measures. But we must know the feet. There are verses like

Bullets would | sing by our | foreheads
and | bullets would | rain at our | feet $\wedge \wedge$

and

$\wedge \wedge$ Mine? | yes a mine. | Countermine. | Down,
down, | and creep | through the hole | .

The first, says Mayor, "naturally" and "taken separately" would read as dactylic; the second as anapaestic; but since we *cannot* scan the second as dactylic, and *could* scan the first as anapaestic, it is best to call both anapaestic (117). This seems a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*. Keats' well known line:

Thea! Thea! Thea! Where is Saturn?
must, I suppose, be scanned:

The | a The | a The | a Where is Sat | urn?!

Why not, however, call it a bit of melodious daring, a discord which makes harmony, a "trochaic" verse, if one will, finely breaking the iambic flow? What difference, after all, whether one reads with Mayor:

\wedge Sud | denly from | him breaks | his wife,
or,
Suddenly | from him | breaks his | wife $\wedge ?$

Let us now take a case where historic treatment could correct the superficial results of scanning by feet. The author is treating the "four-foot iambic." He mentions as an example Tennyson's 'Arabian Nights.' Then he goes on to say that Scott's 'Lay of the Last Minstrel' and Coleridge's 'Christabel' are in the same metre "with frequent anapaestic substitution." In one sense, this is true. But when we classify metre, we must go beyond mere feet. We must get at the movement of the verse in its whole scope, following it all through the poem. In a loose way, Scott's poem and 'Christabel' may be put in the same class. May we do the same with Tennyson's? And is it right to speak of "anapaestic substitution?" To take Tennyson's first, we find, apart from the two opening verses of the prelude, nothing whatever of the free movement so common in 'Christabel.' It is the regular so-called octosyllabic verse. Though doubtless whole passages could be found in 'Christabel' to match passages in the 'Arabian Nights,' we can be quite sure that at heart these two metres are absolutely different. They go back to the two groups of four-stress verse which Schipper denotes as *viertaktig* and *vierhabig*, (cf. Metr. 78 ff.). One, the Romance tendency, cleaves to regular double measures; the other, of Germanic origin, frequently breaks into triple measure. Even in modern times, it is not hypercritical to insist on the distinction, little as the distinction may affect ordinary metres. To call the verse of 'Christabel' iambic with anapaestic substitution, is to assert the direct opposite of the true process. Triple measure is a slowly disappearing factor, not an intruder. Coleridge's supposed "new" metre is found in a host of earlier poems; let us instance the February, May and September eclogues of Spenser's 'Shepheard's Calender,' but with this difference: in the 'Shepheard's Calender,' say 'February,' out of two hundred and forty-six verses, all but a dozen show triple measure (cf. *Amer. Jl. Philol.*, vii. 63); in 'Christabel,' Part I., out of two hundred and seventy verses (eight "defective" not counted) there are fifty-three with genuine triple measure, eleven with triple effect, and two hundred and six without triple measure. Over 20% of 'Christabel,' (Part I.) then, is in the genuine old movement,

and this is enough to color the whole poem. The similarity of movement is evident:

SHEPHEARD'S CALENDAR.
Yet never complained of cold nor heate.

CHRISTABEL.
She folded her hands beneath her cloak,
And stole to the other side of the oak.

SHEPHEARD'S CALENDAR.
From good to badd, and from badde to worse.

CHRISTABEL.
The moon shines dim in the open air.

For alliteration, recalling the real origin of this metre in Anglo-Saxon verse, cf. ("Christabel")

Now in glimmer and now in gloom.

Of course, no one can be blamed for a slip or two. Not much importance is to be attached to the inconsistency, when Mayor quotes as example of "initial truncation" of regular iambic verse:

I wish | I were | where Hel | en lies,
Night | and day | on me | she cries;

and, on p. 130, speaks of the verses:

We close the weary eye,
Saviour ever near,

as "mixed iambic and trochaic," when the case is the same (initial truncation) as above. But in the case of the chapter on Surrey and Marlowe, there is neglect of some very plain historic considerations which the author could hardly have neglected if he had read Schröer's essay in the *Anglia*, 'Ueber die Anfänge des Blankverses in England,' which shows how much is due to the principle of syllable-counting. Scanning by modern rules leads to such a notation as this (p. 137):

The fell | Ajax | and ef | ther A | trides.
o i | 2 o | o i | o o | i o

To sum up: our author's treatment of verse is not so much incorrect as incomplete. The scheme, or metrical basis, is well handled; we miss a good account of rhythm and the individuality of verse. Our English measures, or feet, far more than the classic, derive their meaning and influence less from themselves than from their relations as coherent parts. A verse is a harmonious sum of relations of continuous measures, not simply a sequence of harmonious similar measures. As Ellis and Sylvester have pointed out, a rhythmic connexion can run through a whole series of verses. Hence we take a verse as unit, analyze it for its scheme, its ground-plan, or combine it with

other verses to form a rhythmic group—like the stanza. Bare, scanning by feet is not enough. "Metric," says Sylvester, "guards the 'ear, Synectic satisfies, Chromatic (tone-color, etc.) charms it." To stop at "feet," is to obtain the metric skeleton, but to forego the curves and color of the flesh, the grace of posture, the delight of motion.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

New Bedford.

Dialogues français par JOH. STORM. Copenhagen (Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1887).

This collection of French dialogues deserves especial attention as being a new protest against the old method of teaching modern languages, by a philologist of high reputation in the learned world, Professor Storm of the University of Christiania. Naturally enough, every distinguished name that is added to the aggressive school gives it renewed strength, and it is therefore of some interest to see what principles exactly are advocated by the new adherent.

It might almost have been expected that a scholar like Storm, even when advocating a practical study of the modern languages, would not take his position among the extreme reformers, of whom many sacrifice critical method and thoughtful effort to easy-going imitation. Storm, indeed, insists that modern languages should be learned more by imitation than by rules, but he would build, however, on the solid basis of a methodical grammar, only that this grammar should include not a mass of bewildering details, but simply the leading features of the language, its paradigms and a few short and clear rules. And by his empirical method he does not mean that the pupil should be taken through a heavy volume of disconnected grammatical rules, mingled in the Ollendorff manner helter-skelter with childish exercises of all kinds of possible and impossible combinations. He means that he should early be put to reading easy prose, especially such as reflects most truly the unaffected style of common life, and be held to imitate its style, and, farther, that his reading should be accompanied by a systematical study of ordinary idiomatic phraseology.

In his '*Dialogues français*,' a book prepared specially for Scandinavian undergraduates who have had already two or three years in French, Storm attempts to furnish the means for such systematical study. The exercises, consisting of brief dialogues on various topics, are arranged so as to illustrate in methodical order the use of the various parts of speech, and every sentence introduced is instructive and worth committing. There can be no question that a vast amount of invaluable practice in using the language naturally and yet intelligently may be acquired by the use of such exercises, all instinct with well selected French idioms, and the adaptation of his work for the American public, would no doubt be very acceptable wherever a speaking knowledge of the language is of primary importance.

Whether his method should be recommended for the prescribed courses in our schools and colleges is at least questionable. That in Scandinavia, where, on an average, five years is devoted to French by young students preparing for the University, a couple of years can be devoted to its practical acquisition seems plausible enough; and yet the attempt in this line has hitherto been decidedly abortive there. Thanks to a vast amount of French writing, the clever student may, indeed, in the ordeal of his final examination, be able to hammer together a French composition in which he meets with no accident in applying the accidents of grammar, and in which the moodiness of the subjunctive mood is scrupulously gratified; but natural, idiomatic French he cannot write, and with regard to pronunciation and reading he is hardly more advanced than the American undergraduate, *where well taught*, after a study amounting to little more than one-third of the time used by the Scandinavian youth. To introduce into the prescribed courses of our colleges and universities the method of teaching students to speak and write the modern languages, would be yet more inexpedient than in the Scandinavian schools, because the time allotted to the modern languages here is so much shorter. Something may be done with advantage by way of incidental instruction, and much in elective classes, but not otherwise.

Of course, Storm's exercises are intended to

remedy the evil now existing, and help the learner more directly and surely than was possible with the older method to a speaking and writing familiarity with French. It will do so undoubtedly, but yet always, as we think, by an expenditure of time that for the general student might be made more fruitful. That much that is one-sided, wasteful and pedantic in the purely analytical method, where it is made its own end, must be discarded, and much that is excellent in the empirical or 'natural' method be adopted, is unquestionable; but that the instruction of modern languages in institutions of college or university scope should aim if not exclusively, at least pre-eminently, to affect the whole mental training of the student, to develop his critical and comparative faculties as well as his literary and philological insight, seems equally self-evident. Not more than one among ten of our students would be likely to be really benefited by a speaking knowledge of French; the remaining nine would have to learn it at a great cost simply to forget it again.

But this digression has led me off further than was intended, and I will close by repeating my appreciation of Professor Storm's scholarly work, which cannot fail to aid very materially any student that will make use of it in order to acquire a good speaking knowledge of French.

HJALMAR EDGREN.

State University of Nebraska.

LATIN INFLUENCE ON FRENCH TRAGEDY.

Seneca's Einfluss auf Jean de La Péruse's 'Médée' und Jean de la Taille's 'La Famine ou les Gabeonites.' I. von OTTO KULCKE. Dissertation. Greifswald.

Die Tropen und Figuren bei R. Garnier, ihrem Inhalte nach untersucht und in den römischen Tragödien mit der lateinischen Vorlage verglichen, von HANS RAEDER. Dissertation. Kiel.

Year by year appear dissertations about the style of different pieces of literature, especially French. If we examine them and try to find out how much they have helped Romance

philology to make a step forward, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that only a scanty number have any claim to what all pretend to be, a "specimen eruditio[n]is." Some of the compilers seem to feel this lack of scholarship in their productions and hope to repair the insufficiency, in some measure, by the promise of a subsequent comparative and more exhaustive investigation, which we should like to see, but which we fear will never come to light, as the scheme followed in these researches can never lead to a satisfactory result. (Conf. F. Kaulen. *Die Poetik Boileau's*. Münster. Diss. 81). On the other hand these scholars, in their ardor to produce something more than a compilation, are inclined to read from among the number of Figures of Speech things that cannot be ascertained, and to construe the mental sphere and character of a poet from the percentage of characteristic Tropes. (Conf. P. Kahnt. *Gedankenkreis der Sentenzen in Jodelle's und Garnier's Tragödien und Seneca's Einfluss auf denselben*. Marburger Diss.).

Kulcke's essay is a fair exception to the rest. This is the first attempt at ventilating the subject in a scientific manner. The collected material of Rhetorical Figures is distributed in the following groups:

- I. Entlehnungen und Uebertragungen aus der Medea des Seneca.
- II. Bilder, welche bei S. und im Altfrz. vorkommen.
- III. Bilder, welche bei S. und Péruse, nicht aber im Altfrz. gefunden werden.
- IV. Bilder, dem Altertum bekannt (abgesehen von S.) und durch das Altfrz. auf P. übergegangen.
- V. Bilder, im Altertum bekannt und auch bei P. ohne afrz. Parallelen.
- VI. Aus dem Altertume nicht belegbare, im Altfrz. bekannte und auch bei P. gefundene Bilder.
- VII. Bilder, zu welchen auch im Altfrz. keine Parallelen gefunden wurden.

If the author had discriminated in II. and III. between words that belong to Seneca's diction alone and those that may be found in other Latin writers, this scheme would be most per-

fect and indisputable in theory. But the carrying out of this plan is beyond one student's power as it embraces too vast a field of research. This dissertation would have been improved had the author restricted himself to narrower limits. He made use of some pamphlets on the style of Latin and Old French authors, but this number is too small for the comprehensive plan he laid out to secure for any one of his quotations in his categories (except I. and II.) absolute correctness.

As La Péruse followed Seneca, the striking resemblances of both tragedians must be regarded as direct influences, and for a proof of this dependency, the contemporary writers of La Péruse have to be consulted. The fact that the same Figures are also used in the *Chanson de Roland* or by Chrestien de Troies does not interfere at all with the research, unless it be proved that they were laid under contribution. Thus the following verses—

decus illud ingens Graeciae et florem inclitum
Medea 225.

Ores par mon molen la fleur de la noblesse
Et la race des Dieus triomfe dans la Grece.

Médée 27.

are in closer connection than they appear by the quotation of

de (dulce) France la flur. Ch. d. Roland 2431.

The same with

non potest in nos tuum errare fulmen. Medea 537.
Dardés, ô Dieus, dardez vos foudres sur son chef.
Médée 9, 24.

which we should like to see quoted under I. instead of II.

In V.

Vous porteriez couronne,
Comme l'honneur de votre sang l'ordonne.
Médée 17, 28.

is decidedly due to Seneca and should have been inserted in I.

edit genitos sanguine claro. O. 92.

qui nato suo
praeferre potuit sanguine alieno satum O. 144.

Troades 472. O. 301, etc.

Ô moy sous le Soleil la plus infortunée. Médée 11.

is traced back to

Litora voce replet sub utroque iacentia Phœbo.
Ovid, Met. I. 338.

Here are some of Seneca's expressions that have totally escaped the author:

utraequa Phoebi domus H. O. 2. utrumque Phoebi litus H. O. 1703. ubi quo sub axe H. O. 155. sub axe libyco H. O. 912. sub axe frigido H. O. 285. 1255. sub hoc mundo H. O. 1615. sub ortu solis H. 1146.

In VI.

Quand les Cianées mons
Comme Toreaus furieus
S'entreheurtoient frons à frons. Médée 13, 17.

corresponds to Seneca :

premere subiectos iugo
tauros ferores. O. 425.

sic ille magni parvus armenti comes
ceruice subito celsus et fronde ardus
gregem paternum dicit ac pecori imperat. Tr. 546.

Th. 70.

Sometimes the words will not exactly correspond, but the influence cannot be denied when the source shows a remarkable frequency of the phrase in question. Thus in VII.

l'echauffé courrouz qui dans mon coeur bouillonne.
Médée 34, 17.

atque ira pari
ardent mariti, mutua flagrant face. O. 51.

et ita praeceps quaeque succensas agit
libido mentes. Ph. 549.

hic urit animos pertinax nimium fauor. O. 806.
iramque flammis iam residentem incitas. A. 262.

Th. 494. 106. 284. O. 137. 555. 342. Th. 98,
etc.

In spite of these mistakes and many others that will certainly be detected upon closer examination, the work has its value as the first systematic attempt in this interesting matter.

The second dissertation does not deserve the same praise. The title is misleading. How the author can assume this to be a comparative study of Garnier's style and that of the Latin tragedies is not intelligible. Occasional footnotes—all taken from "Octavia!"—are no excuse for this error. "Hippolyte," "La Troadé" and "Antigone" are omitted, "as they are more or less translations from the classics," though a few lines before we read: "The mental state of a person is less apparent from what he speaks about than from the manner in which he speaks." Starting from this principle the author would have been expected to make just these three tragedies the subject of his treatise. It would have been interesting

to see how far Garnier imitated the style of Seneca. "H." "Tr." and "A." are called translations! But it must be remembered that Garnier often made a free use of his model even in these tragedies—there is the closest resemblance between "Hippolyte" and "Phaedra," the Chorus of the third act of "La Troadé" is from Horace, agreements with whom are to be found everywhere, especially in "Porcie" and "Cornelie." "Antigone" betrays the influence of Statius.

The author pretends to prove the independence (!) of Garnier's diction in the first three tragedies by comparing them with "Octavia." If he had taken into consideration the rest of the Latin tragedies, he would have found that Seneca left a deep mark upon Garnier's language. Examples could be quoted for almost every page of that compilation, but having stated these fundamental errors I abstain from any further details. The author's purpose "to show the peculiarities of Garnier's diction and to give us an insight into the intellectual condition of the tragic poets of his century" missed its aim. The difference of "Bradamante" and the tragedies is not pointed out by any remark.

In all investigations of this kind it ought always to be kept in mind that we want to see what belongs to the author himself, what is the possession of his contemporaries and what he owes to his models.

The dependence of Garnier upon Seneca invites to a comparative research of style, a work that requires perseverance, but the results of which will certainly be valuable enough to reward largely for the time spent on it. I should like to suggest a comparison of the typical Figures of Speech, those that are used by both writers most frequently. Many points of the poetical use of words would thus be elucidated, as, for instance, the use of indefinite numbers (*cent* and *mille*) and of *tant* and *tant de* in sentences where the second member of comparison is wanting. The contemporary writers must also be investigated, especially Ronsard. The discovered analogies may be traced through Mairet and Rotrou until they shade off into that language which we admire in Corneille and Racine.

H. SCHMIDT.

University of North Carolina.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

The German Classics from the Fourth to the Nineteenth Century with Biographical Notices, Translations into modern German, and Notes by F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. A New Edition, revised, enlarged, and adapted to Wilhelm Scherer's History of German Literature by F. LICHTENSTEIN. 2 Vols., crown 8vo, pp. xix. 711; xi. 677. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1886.

Since the publication of the English translation of Scherer's classical 'History of German Literature' the interest in the earlier literary life of Germany has measurably increased, both in this country and in England. The book was to many a revelation, and the pleasurable surprise at first experienced, naturally gave birth to a desire to become acquainted with the wealth of ideas and world of feelings of which Scherer so instructively and entertainingly narrated. And as an outgrowth of Scherer's organic conception and representation of the history of German literature, this desire has directed itself largely to the older documents of German literature, hitherto known only to professional scholars.

To the laudable efforts of Max Müller, the eminent philologist and untiring scientific and literary mediator between the two great Teutonic nations, we owe it that the English reader who is equipped with a good knowledge of modern German, can now easily follow the development of German literature from its earliest beginnings. While Scherer was still among the living Professor Müller consulted with him in regard to a new edition of his own 'German Classics,' which was to be adapted to Scherer's 'History.' Scherer willingly consented, and suggested one of his most promising pupils, Prof. Franz Lichtenstein, to make the selections; while he himself collected the specimens by which Goethe was to be represented. The untimely death of both scholars prevented them from seeing the volumes in print, but the material had fortunately all been gathered, and Scherer himself regarded the work as an illustration of his History of German Literature.

While the two volumes before us are thus a source of information and enjoyment for the

intelligent reader and are well adapted to awaken and spread the love for German antiquity, they fulfill at the same time a still further purpose. The collection may be viewed not only from a literary, but also from a philological standpoint, as representing the development of the German language in its various stages; and the work will certainly be used with great profit by those who desire to become acquainted with the history of the language. There are, of course, Readers for each of the principal periods of the German language, in which, however, the important phases of transition cannot be sufficiently treated. The student who hitherto wished to follow carefully the growth of the language, without having at his disposal the original editions, which are frequently scarce and expensive, could only refer to Wackernagel's excellent but far more voluminous historical reader. On a smaller scale, but with relative completeness, he will now find most that is necessary for his purpose in Professor Müller's 'German Classics.'

It is perhaps unnecessary to suggest that Scherer's æsthetic taste as well as his philological thoroughness are equally reflected in these volumes. Of all the writers represented there is scarcely one, the most significant specimen of whose literary character has not been chosen. And we also find writers given here, for whom we might look in vain in similar collections. But still, the 'German Classics' is a companion book to Scherer's 'History of German Literature,' and the latter's faults as well as its excellencies (pointed out in the NOTES for May, 1886) have been to a certain degree repeated in the former. While the art of discriminating lights and shades constitutes one of the greatest charms of Scherer's history of literature, this feature becomes a defect in a chrestomathy which undertakes also to represent the gradual growth of the language. The philologist looks with equal interest upon every linguistic phenomenon, and favors especially the periods of transition, previously referred to, as the time of the crystalization of those linguistic and æsthetic forms in which the greater period to follow will find its expression. One consequently would prefer a few more specimens from the

time that marks the gradual transition from the Old High German to the Middle High German form of speech. The stage previous to the Reformation, however, is very well represented. Since Scherer has made Luther the central figure of Germany's literary life in the sixteenth century, there seems to be no reason why the difference in Luther's language and style before and after the year 1520 should not have been distinctly marked by a specimen from his writings before that year. It will also be observed that owing to Luther's prominent position Hans Sachs has been relegated to the background in the 'History of German Literature' as well as in the 'Classics.' And yet we believe that his influence upon Goethe would have justified more specimens of his style, not to speak of his great ascendancy over his contemporaries.

Passing to modern times, the reader will doubtless be puzzled at first to divine why Lessing is not counted among the German classics. But he will soon discover that this has been done in conformity with the classification adopted by Scherer's History. The question as to why Lessing is represented chiefly by specimens containing his philosophical and religious views is open to discussion; but the selections made from Herder's prose and poetry do full justice to that great man, who has so often been misrepresented and disregarded.

The prominent position assigned to Goethe in the 'History of German Literature' is also given to him in the historical Reader. According to Professor Müller's statement, the specimens from Goethe were chosen by Scherer himself in order to illustrate the development of Goethe's various styles. The selection is excellent in every respect, and I would only suggest that a future edition should contain Goethe's essay: "Einfache Nachahmung der Natur, Manier und Stil," upon which Scherer's views concerning the various periods of Goethe's style are based.

The text of the earlier documents is given after the standard editions, those of the Lachmann-School being generally preferred. Minor misprints like "trauerndtief" for trauernd-tief (II, 161) will probably disappear in a second edition.

The use of so excellent a book as Professor Müller's 'German Classics' should not be confined to a small circle of lovers of German literature. Since it represents so well the development of the German language, it will be of great value for those who are intent upon more than the cheap glitter of a few Indo-Germanic forms, and who, as future teachers of German, need a thorough knowledge of the history of the German language and literature. With the proper method and under competent guidance such a knowledge may well be attained by the systematic study of this scholarly work.

JULIUS GOEBEL.

Geschlechtswechsel im Französischen — Ein Versuch der Erklärung desselben. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der philosophischen Doctorwürde an der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen von HERMANN SACHS. Frankfurt a. O. 1886.

In the first part of the above work, the author cites the neuter plurals which are still found in Old French retaining both their neuter plural form and meaning; as, for example, in the *Chanson d'Antioche* 47, "Contre le roi ala *lie brace* levee." Then follows a list of original neuter plurals, oscillating in O. Fr. between masc. and fem. On account of their endings, these words were treated as fem., and on account of their derivation—and this was perhaps mostly learned influence—they were treated as masc. Any student of O. Fr. will be able to call to mind many such examples; here only one for illustration (the author undertakes to give a complete list): *voile* in O. Fr. is both masc. and fem., without any difference in signification, e. g., *et puis nagierent a plain voille*. Chr. IV. 139; *il tendoyt le vele*. Rab. Next follows a long list of words ending in *e*, not coming from Lat. neut. plurals. They are mostly learned words, or have *e* according to the law of atonic finals. The same oscillation is seen here. The author does not attempt to draw any conclusions, but merely enumerates the words, e. g., *huile*, *horloge*, *exemple*, etc. We are next offered a very interesting list of words ending in suffixes, homonyms in French,

but referable to different genders in Latin. On account of the likeness of ending the words oscillate in gender. Such suffixes are *-aticum* and *-aginem=age*, *entium* and *entia=ence*, etc.

On p. 34, *pistace* is erroneously cited as influenced by such words as *dédicace*, *préface*. The correct and only form of the word is *pistache*, cf. Littré, the Dictionary of the Academy, etc. The fem. gender of *mer* our author, following Meyer, explains as a result of the same influence as is shown in the Span. phrase, *andar la tierra y la mar* for *andar la tierra y lo mar*. The period in which the gender of all these words was fixed, seems to have been the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; a time when so many other artificial discriminations in French grammar were made.

The monograph as a whole brings out nothing new, but is a very handy compilation of what had been stated by the author's predecessors, especially Tobler, Mussafia, W. Meyer, and Littré, among later writers, and Marot and Palsgrave, among the older; and most of his references are taken from their writings. It should be said, however, by way of explanation, that the present brochure contains only a part of the author's doctor-dissertation.

J. E. MATZKE.

Johns Hopkins University.

WHITNEY'S FRENCH GRAMMAR.

A Practical French Grammar; with Exercises and Illustrative Sentences from French Authors, by WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology and Instructor in Modern Languages in Yale College. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1886, 12mo, pp. xiii, 442.

In the making of text-books, no less than in the other and more general relations of life, it is felt to be a truism that *noblesse oblige*; and the production of a practical grammar of so widely studied a language as French, by the most distinguished of American philologists, will naturally be looked to as promising a notable exemplification of the principle. High expectations are warrantably aroused; serious

scrutiny and earnest criticism are accorded as a matter of right.

From the first step in the examination of the merits and defects of the volume before us—which, as Professor Whitney states, has been the outcome of the author's experience as a teacher of French during many years in one of the departments of Yale College—the conclusion will constantly press for recognition that the labor bestowed in the preparation of this book can scarcely be regarded as in any sense a labor of love, much less as the fruit of wide and special knowledge. A curious illustration of the author's attitude towards what may be called the literature of his subject, is given at the close of the preface: "The grammars of which most use has been made in the preparation of this one are that of Meissner (of which there is a re-working in English, under the name of 'French Syntax,' by Professor J. A. Harrison—a valuable work, especially for teachers) and that of Ploetz." Not to speak of Professor Whitney's willingness to leave out of the account such practical grammars as those of Lücking and Plattner, what must not be the surprise of the venerable Nestor of living grammarians and lexicographers, Dr. Mätzner, of Berlin, to find himself thus confused by Professor Whitney with Mätzner's friend and admirer of a younger generation, Prof. Meissner, of Belfast? There is no desire to exaggerate the significance of such a slip,^x though it is safe to assume that, where a question of Sanskrit was involved, no such mistaken interchange of names could have been made by the author in the analogous case, for example, of Wilson (H. H.) and Williams (Monier)! But, unfortunately, the confusion does not stop with the mere names, for the passage quoted implies that Professor Harrison's 'French Syntax' is a re-working of Mätzner's well-known 'Französische Grammatik,' rather than of the latter's long since "vergriffene" 'Französische Syntax.' Would it not, again, in all reasonableness, have been fairer to teachers of the present day who happen to be in need of any such information at all (they are fewer, perhaps, than the author imagines), if so respected a guide as Professor Whitney, instead of men-

^x It has been silently rectified in later impressions of the Grammar.

tioning only Brachet's Grammar and Etymological Dictionary as aids to philological study (p. 203), had been disposed to help them a step forward, by intimating that Brachet's Historical Grammar, while still serviceable, has been variously supplanted, in recent years, by convenient hand-books and works of reference?

It is much to be regretted, also, that the burning question which bears upon the proper place of practical and theoretical phonetics in the elementary teaching of modern languages, should not have been at least broached by Professor Whitney, either in his preface, or in the preliminary chapter on pronunciation. "Different teachers will make different use of the chapter [on pronunciation] in instruction, according to their various training and habit;" yet the introduction of a brief series of systematically arranged practical *exercises* in pronunciation, which teachers of whatever training or habit could and should have been earnestly recommended to apply frequently, faithfully and vivaciously for the first few weeks with beginners, would have simplified matters in a most important degree. In regard to accuracy, we are most justly told that distinct statements as to the facts of pronunciation are required for the guidance of pupils, and are of no small value to the teacher also, unless he have enjoyed very exceptional advantages; but some of the most important statements on the subject are so misleading as to prove an embarrassment rather than an assistance, especially to the "great majority of teachers not French by birth or education." In this respect, the grammar falls far short of the corresponding preliminary chapter in Ploetz. Thus, for example, under the vowel *a* (p. 4), the words *la* and *a* are grouped with *cas* and *bras*, as examples of "very nearly the full open sound of the English *a* in *far* or *father*;" while *âme* and *pâle* are given along with *ami* and *animal*, as illustrations of the rule that "elsewhere, *a* is a little flattened, like English *a* in *flat*, *cap*, *jack*, only not quite so much so."—"The sound [of 'mute' or 'silent' *e*] is quite precisely that in English *the* before a consonant in real colloquial utterance: thus, 'tell us *the* name of *the* man,'" *re-gard* and *re-le-va* are given as examples (p. 5), but the difference between the *e* in *regard* (and the first *e* in *releva*)

and that in the colloquially uttered English *the* is marked and important. In fact, English speaking pupils, are, in books, and by teachers who have learned from books, generally taught to slight too much rather than too little the French *e* in such a situation. The vowel *i* is said (p. 8) to have in French "invariably the sound of English 'long *e*,' or of *i* in the words *machine*, *pique*;" and "the error of pronouncing a French *i* anywhere like the English 'short *i*' of *pin*, *finish*, and the like, must be very carefully avoided." But Frenchmen will scarcely differ as to the fact that the *i* of *triste* is nearer to the *i* in *pin* than to that in *machine*. In other words, the *i* in *triste* is short, the *i* in *machine* long, and the distinction, in general, between 'long' and 'short' is one which Professor Whitney altogether too much obscures; while in regard to quality, no difference is recognized between *eu fermé*, as in *peu*, and *eu ouvert*, as in *œuvre* (p. 11), to say nothing of their difference in quantity.

Throughout the first part of the Grammar, the author has introduced occasional philological observations of the briefest sort, in fine type. With that grim fatality which inevitably overtakes the superficial, and which ought to warn the learned, at least, against hazarding statements outside the range of their own science, Professor Whitney's very first venture in this field (Lesson I., p. 29) is an unfortunate error such as he would probably have been spared making by merely turning the pages of any Old or Middle French text, with a view to ascertaining whether the facts of the language bear out his supposed explanation. After attention has been called to the insertion of a euphonic *t* between the 3d pers. sing. of a verb ending in a vowel and its following pronoun, the statement is made that "this *t* is that of the 3d sing. in Latin: thus, *a-t-il* is *habet ille*." The final *t*, however, of the 3d sing. in the present of *avoir*, and in verbs of the first conjugation, disappeared early, and for several centuries the French language permitted hiatus before a following pronoun, e. g., *a il*, *aime on*, etc., the subsequent insertion of *t* being a late phenomenon due to analogy (*est-il*, *part-il*, *dit-on*, etc.).—On p. 63 (a), it is said that "the infinitive (disputed), participles, and imperfect come from the corresponding forms of *stare*,

stand." It is so long since it was disputed that *être* comes from *essere*, for *esse* (instead of from *stare*), that younger scholars cannot remember the time.—Again (p. 127, §4 b) we are told that "*on* is by origin an abbreviation of *homme*," which should read, "*on* is by origin Lat. *homo* (*homme* being Lat. *hominem*)."—These scattered philological remarks in Part I. occupy, all told, some seventy lines.

To the Second Part is prefixed a chapter of six pages on the "Relation of French to Latin." If this be allowed to be a fair proportion of space to devote to the historical aspects of the language in a practical grammar, no fault can be found with the extreme meagreness of treatment; but here again errors crop out: e. g., *aimèrent, amavérunt* is given as an illustration of the statement that the accented syllable of the Latin word is the last fully pronounced syllable of the French word. This example, as here given, involves the double mistake of supposing that Lat. tonic *ē* gives French *é*, and that the 3d pl. of the Lat. perf. preserved its long penult, whereas it shifted its accent to the preceding syllable (*amā[ve]runt=aimèrent*). The first of these errors reappears, in the same list, in the example *cruel, crudelēm* (read **crudalem*, or better, omit this example). Indeed, as Professor Whitney himself naively remarks apropos of another phenomenon (p. 208, 6a), some of the facts of French philology are "very curious."—On p. 207(c), appears again the erroneous statement of the survival of Lat. final *t* in such examples as *a-t-il*.

Turning to the more practical side of the Grammar, one of the first points calling for remark is the entire omission, under the rules for the position of the adjective (pp. 51 and 236) of the convenient statement for beginners, that adjectives of nationality and participial adjectives regularly follow the noun. The whole treatment of the subject, moreover, would have been singularly simplified by a brief elucidation of the fundamental principle involved: viz., that adjectives employed *affectionately* (emotionally) precede the noun, while those used in the way of a purely *intellectual* attribution, follow it (compare *mon cher ami* with *un livre cher*). In all of his discourse about "an adjective used more appositively, or having a

special prominence or emphasis, or signifying something brought forward as new rather than referred to as already understood" (p. 51), and about "a physical meaning rather than an ideal or moral one, and a literal rather than a figurative" (p. 236), Professor Whitney is altogether wide of the mark.—P. 77, 7a, "The French never says, in dates or elsewhere, *eighteen hundred* and so on, but always *(a) thousand eight hundred*, etc." Comment is uncalled for.—P. 118(c), *que de services il m'a rendus*, is mistranslated: 'what services,' etc., (instead of 'how many services,' etc.). This is not a mere oversight, for the same error is repeated p. 336 (§194 c), "*que de choses j'ai vues*, 'what things I have seen!'"—P. 127(4a), "Instead of *on* simply, *l'on* (with the article prefixed) is often used after a vowel sound, especially after *et, ou, où, que, si*: thus, *si l'on voit, if one sees.*" Add, "unless the following word begins with *l*: as, *si on le voit.*"—P. 138(c), "Of the intransitives used reflexively, the most noteworthy is *s'en aller, go away, clear out, be off with one's self* (literally, *go one's self from it.*)" This literal rendering is distinctly misleading, since, if it conveys any meaning, it implies that the verb is used transitively and that the reflexive pronoun is its direct object, whereas the pronoun is here, as elsewhere with intransitive verbs, an indirect dative, partaking somewhat of the nature of a *dativus commodi* (rather than of a *dativus ethicus*), and answering very closely and instructively to the use of the Greek Middle. Exception may fairly be taken, also, to translating *en*, thus idiomatically used with verbs of motion, as 'from it,' since the *en* is here purely adverbial (*inde, thence*) and in this use has never undergone substitution for the genitive case of the personal pronoun. The pupil should be taught to discriminate between the adverbial and the pronominal uses of *en* and *y*, and it is confusing to find given as an example of the use of the "genitive pronoun *en*" (p. 302 h), "*il était à la campagne; il en revient aujourd'hui*," by the side of '*usez-en, mais n'en abusez pas.*'—P. 176 (§4 b), "The pres. subj. is used in good wishes for English *long live*: thus, *vive le roi, long live the king.*" In the expression *qui vive*, 'who goes there?' (literally, *who is alive or stirring*) it is treated as an indicative."

This is really inexcusable. Does Professor Whitney soberly imagine that French subjunctives can be juggled with ("treated," to use his own expression, which is a good one) in this way? His own paragraph affords the key to the situation. The sentinel calls out: *Qui vive?* 'Long live who?' ('For whom do you shout *vive?*' 'Whose side are you on?') The person challenged replies: *Vive le roi;* or *vive la jacquerie* or *la fronde*, as the case may be.—Insufficient rules having been given on the use of capitals, we read, p. 178 (Ex. 38, sentences 12 and 15), "Si votre frère va en Angleterre, il lui faudra apprendre l'Anglais." "Comprenez-vous l'Allemand, mademoiselle?"—P. 226 (§42e), "The plural article is, in a higher narrative style, often put before the name of an individual, to mark him as a person of note and importance: thus, *les Bossuet et les Racine ont été la gloire de leur siècle*, 'Bossuet and Racine were the glory of their century.' Can Professor Whitney mean, as his language and rendering seem plainly to imply, that the plural article here indicates a sort of *pluralis maiestaticus*, rather than simply 'the Bossuets and the Racines,' by a familiar figure of speech?—In the treatment of the tenses (pp. 264-8), the preterit is in no way characterized as the *historical* tense, nor is the contrast brought out between the use of the preterit as marking the leading events of an historical narration, and that of the imperfect, as introducing its accessory features.—P. 274 (§133), the use of *il semble* with the subjunctive is noted, but nothing is said of *il me semble* with the indicative, although an example of this latter use is given in the illustrative sentences (p. 276, 10).—P. 282 (§139a), "In familiar speech, especially, the use of an imperfect subjunctive, is strictly avoided, by various devices, and in part by putting the present in its place." The reservation should have been made that, even in familiar speech, it is only the uneuphonious imperfect subjunctives in *-asse* and *-usse* that are "strictly avoided."—Under the treatment of the negation, no mention is made of the construction *ne—ni ne*, although a sentence requiring it is given for translation ('I neither admire her nor love her,' p. 312, 17).—P. 308, §169, it is said that *non* "may be followed by the second

negative *pas* (not by *point*)."
Non point is of frequent occurrence.—P. 308, §169d, "Non had formerly the office of directly making a verb negative, and is sometimes still found so used, in antiquated style: thus, *non ferai-je*, 'I shall not do.'"
Non survives, in this use, solely with the verb *faire*, and *non ferai-je* means 'No, I shall not' (the *ferai* being a substitute for whatever idea is negated, e. g., 'go,' 'stay'). This construction is the negative counterpart of the much more frequently occurring *si fait*, literally, 'yes he does,' (the form of the 3d person having crowded out the others). The latter phrase—which is not given (cf. p. 341, §200b)—is much better entitled to mention in a practical grammar than the other.

A closing chapter is devoted to French Versification. It falls into the lamentable error not only of denying the melodious and exceedingly varied *accentual principle* of French verse, but even of ignoring the existence of the *caesura!* No wonder that English-speaking students find difficulty in recognizing and appreciating the rhythm of French poetry, when they are taught that "a French line of verse is only a certain number of successive syllables, with a rhyme at the end" (p. 354, §232).

Teachers, then, will have many an erroneous precept and impression to counteract, in using this grammar with their pupils. Yet, after so many strictures, it is a pleasure, as well as simple justice, to turn to a more grateful aspect of the critic's functions, and cordially to recognize in the book many excellencies that have laid all instructors of elementary French in this country under real and present, if, as we may desire and hope, only temporary obligations. With the exception of the exercises—which have evidently been prepared by a novice (cf. such English as 'He will be able, if you shall be able,' p. 121, 10, 'It is very long that his friends have not seen him,' p. 312, 9)—the grammar displays on every page abundant evidence of Professor Whitney's careful and experienced manipulation. Part I. is simple and progressive, and above all treats the pronouns and the irregular verbs in a compact and sensible manner. It furnishes a convenient and sufficiently complete handbook to the French accent, with a fair share of the

necessary appliances for drill and practice. Part II. supplies a *desideratum* long felt, especially for college classes, in affording a systematic and, within certain limits, scholarly compend of the leading facts of French grammar. While scarcely categorical enough for easy use by younger pupils, Professor Whitney's presentation of the doctrine of the subjunctive, for example, and of the infinitive, may be pointed to as comparing favorably, both in spirit and manner, with corresponding passages in his incomparable Sanskrit grammar. The idea of the Illustrative Sentences from French authors, in this part, is in itself a good one, though sometimes carried out with questionable judgment. The sentences given are too often provokingly in need of a context, while the introduction of such an antiquated specimen as '*J'ai ouï dire à feu ma sœur que sa fille et moi naquîmes la même année*,' to illustrate a simple point in grammar (the use of *feu*), is not edifying in an elementary work. It shows that the range of three centuries allowed in the choice of examples, may be made to seem too wide.

There is an excellent system of references for words irregular or peculiar in pronunciation; the vocabularies and indexes are refreshingly complete (*concert* is wanting, to cover sentence 18, p. 134), and misprints are admirably few (but cf. *l'abbé de Sainte Gèneviève*, p. 237, 4, and read §137a instead of §131a, p. 429, 2d col., under 'so,' l. 4). Professor Whitney's philological sense has stood him in good stead in the matter of rejecting exploded etymologies and in using the question-mark for doubtful cases (yet *hoc illud* is given for *oui*; and *per-ustum*, for *brûler*, should have a ?). The book is attractively printed, on good paper and with clear type. It is to be hoped that teachers of French, whether in or out of college, will for the present consider this the very best of grammars in English for use in their elementary classes.

One more serious word remains: let it be spoken frankly, yet with all the consideration due from the beginner to the veteran. There is a regret which the fraternity of French scholars may justly feel entitled to indulge with regard to Professor Whitney. It is, that after many years' teaching of French in one of

our foremost universities, and even when about to write a grammar of the French language, he, with all his royal training and capabilities, should not have felt a sufficiently intelligent interest in the subject of French philology, to find himself impelled to look about him, and to inform himself of the status and results of this subtle, broad and vigorous science.

H. A. TODD.

York Plays. The Plays Performed by the Crafts or Mysteries of York, on the day of Corpus Christi, in the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Centuries. Now first Printed from the Unique Manuscript in the Library of Lord Ashburnham. Edited, with Introduction and Glossary, by LUCY TOULMIN SMITH, Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1885. 8vo, pp. lxxviii+557.

Abraham and Isaac. A Norfolk Mystery, edited from the Brome Hall Manuscript by LUCY TOULMIN SMITH. *Anglia*, Band vii., Heft 3, 1884, pp. 316-337.

To say that the works above noted are the first really serviceable editions of English Mysteries yet produced may seem to imply a harsh judgment of precedent work; and yet the statement is true. We have had the records of erratic and unrelated research in the works of Sharp, Marriott, and Warton; we have had also the diverting narratives of explorations of Hone and Disraeli; and we have had the very good second-hand summaries of Morley, Collier and Ward. But, for the scholar's use, all of the works above noted, excellent as they are for certain purposes, are most inadequate, and exasperation succeeds to hope when one attempts to use them as assistants to any real investigation. One needs such careful studies as those of Sepet, Klein, de Julleville and Ebert, and they are not at hand. Even the editions of the Miracle Play Cycles that we have—the Townley plays, edited with laborious ineptitude by Mr. Stevenson, the Coventry plays by Mr. Halliwell, and the Chester series, edited (with much plum-plucking of collateral matter from

¹ The Cornish plays have been well edited by Mr. Whitley Stokes.

abroad) by Mr. Thos. Wright—must be used with the greatest caution, for the reason that there is in them no constant equation of error. One can never be sure whether the occurrence of an unusual form is due to careless proof-reading; to an "error of the Scribe," the usual recourse of the puzzled editor; to an error by the editor's copyist; or to normalizing by the editor. To give utterance to these truths is most ungracious, for all this editing has been a labour of love, and the unpaid worker deserves our thanks, yet inasmuch as it is nearly half a century since most of this work was done, plainness of speech may be permitted.

All that we have said concerning the lack of scientific method of study of the English plays was, till within a very recent period, true also of the greater field of Early Continental Liturgical and Didactic Dramas. But in the last decade great advance has been made in the investigation of the Earlier Mysteries and especially of the vast French remains.

Between 1876 and 1881 appeared the great editions of the *Nostre Dame Mysteries*, edited by Gaston Paris, the fifteenth century *Passion* (Greban's), by the same editor assisted by M. Raynaud, and the *Mystere du viel Testament* by M. Rothschild. During this time have also appeared numerous monographs on various topics, and also the remarkable work of de Julleville.

It was the work of Rothschild, says Miss Smith, that first directed her attention to the York Plays, and the volume before us is the result. The object of this note is not formally to review² the book, but to call attention to the literary and linguistic value of the plays themselves and to the aid that this volume gives to the scholar.

At first glance, the field of study in English Mysteries seems somewhat limited. Even if we include the Cornish plays, there are in existence in England hardly more than twenty-two MSS., including portions of ten distinct

Cycles, and one hundred and sixty-three plays, as follows:

Locality.	Description.	Plays, complete MSS.	Com- ments and late Copies.
Dublin	Fragments of Cycle	1	1
Chester	Full Cycle	25	5
Cornwall	Cycle	3	1
"	Single Play	3	3
Coventry	Full Cycle	42	1
Croxtion	Single Play	1	1
Newcastle	Fragments of Cycle	1	1
Norfolk	Single Play	1	1
Norwich	" "	1	1
Wakefield	Townley Cycle	32	1
York	Full Cycle	48	1
Unknown	Single Plays	5	5
		163	22
			10

And yet, for special reasons, these Plays are of great value for their matter and for their form. They are of value for their matter: partly because of the simple, tender, realistic unquestioning treatment of a great topic; and still more, because, being upon a common topic and from various localities, we have an index to the attitude of the masses in widely separated counties toward a great subject. They are of value for their form: partly because the verse is always rhythmic and sometimes strong; and mainly because the words and the rhymes give us completely the people's language of half a dozen cities at fairly settled dates. I know of no other middle English writings which, within the same compass of matter, will give the moderately advanced student such a range of opportunity for investigation of the temper of mind and the method of expression of the masses.

For elemental dialect studies they are equally valuable, since their general agreement is so marked that the tracing of variation is easy, and since duplicate presentations frequently give the needed corrections without recourse to notes or conjectures. A Seminary class could easily read the entire series in a term, together with Ebert, Klein and de Julleville, or Mone, Sepet and D'Ancona.

For study of such sort, this volume is admirably fitted.

In the first place, the text is not only accurate, but it is unnormalized, and only those who have compared some well-known Early English Text Society's editions with the original

² See reviews as follows:

Englische Studien, . . . XI: 449, Joseph Hall.
Anglia, . . . VIII: 161, L. Proescholdt.
Sat. Rev. . . . 60: 233, Aug. 15, 1885.
Scot. Rev. . . . 6: 220, Oct. 1885.
Nation. . . . 41: 242, Sept. 17, 1885.
Journal of Philology, . . . VII: 518, Dec. 1886, J. M. Garnett.

manuscript can know how rare is this merit. For other matters of clerical detail, one may say that the glossary is inoffensive and that such notes as are made on points of grammar and dialectal variations are suggestive rather than dogmatic. In the second place, the Plays are throughout edited with a painstaking intelligence which is most hopeful.

In the Introduction, the history, sources, method and metres of the plays are really studied, and in the body of the work the constant care in giving cross-references, original authorities, suggestions, and explanations, makes the study of this single volume a guide to a large portion of the general subject.

For these reasons, I commend this volume to students of English and hope the forthcoming edition of the *Townley Mysteries* will prove to be equally worthy of attention.

F. H. STODDARD.

University of California.

PORtUGUESE LITERATURE.

Corso de Historia da Litteratura Portugueza,
por THEOPHILo BRAGA. 8vo, 6+411 pp.
Lisboa, Nova Livraria Internacional, 1885.*

On the tenth of June, 1880, was enacted in Lisbon one of the most remarkable pageants ever witnessed in any country or in any age. It was the tercentenary of Camoens' death, when literary representatives from the civilized world gathered in the Portuguese capital to help his countrymen pay appropriate homage to the memory of the great poet. The remains of the bard and those of the statesman whose valorous deeds he had sung, Vasco da Gama, were transferred to the same resting-place, while kings, princes, nobles and people joined the *literati* in making this the most unique occasion in the nation's history. Hundreds of special publications, artistic productions and historical contributions bearing upon the life and writings of the singer of the *Lusiads* were issued, and served to mark a notable era in the literary life of Portugal. It was the beginning of a new epoch that has since been prolific in works and monographs of special investigation into the sources and earliest docu-

ments of Lusitanian lore. A recasting of methods in the treatment of her literary history has naturally followed, and one of the best examples of it is seen in the treatise before us. The man who seems to be actuated above all others by something of the literary spirit that moved the great Camoens, is the author of this work. His unflagging energy, his wonderful capacity for work, his extraordinary production, have scarcely been surpassed in the same length of time by any *littérateur* of the Peninsula, and, particularly in modern times, has his example been exceptional among his countrymen. Fired by an unwavering patriotism, he has pushed forward against insurmountable obstacles, making known to the world outside the rich treasures of Portuguese lore and carrying back to his countrymen, so exclusive in their literary life, those germs of modern European thought whose liberalizing influences have emancipated modern culture and raised it above the formalism and narrowness of that of mediæval times.

In the spirit of reform, the author wrote, in 1875, his "Manual de Historia da Litteratura portugueza," which was a failure because it was so much in advance of the public demand; or, as a critic facetiously said of it: "Acharam-o sempre grande, e que por este motivo deixavam de o adoptar." In this work the writer formulated his canon of literary criticism in the following words: "A reforma do ensino da litteratura deve partir da conclusão a que chegou a sciencia moderna que o estudo das creações intellectuaes não se pode fazer em abstracto. É necessário nunca abandonar a comunicação directa com os monumentos, explicando-os e apreciando-os pelas suas relações historicas como o meio e circunstancias em que foram produzidas. O estudo da litteratura feito nas vagas generalidades, conduz a essas receitas de tropos, que tiram a seriedade as mais altas concepções do espírito humano. Na instrução de um paiz deve entrar com toda a sua importancia um elemento nacional; no ensino fundado nas ócas abstracções nunca esse sentimento se desperta." It is in conformity with this doctrine that the "Corso de Historia da Litteratura" represents the last stage of growth of the author's literary con-

* Extracted from "The American Journal of Philology," Vol. VIII., pp. 92-95.

ception, promulgated with unbounded enthusiasm in a long series of publications during a long term of years. It has behind it twenty volumes of the "Historia da Litteratura portugueza," twelve volumes of "Fontes tradicionaes," "O Cancioneiro portuguez do Vaticana," various critical editions of national poets, "Os Elementos da Nacionalidade portugueza," the "Historia da Pedagogia em Portugal," "Systema de Sociologia," and, moreover, a decade and a half of active service as Professor of Modern Literature, especially of Portuguese literature, in the Corso Superior de Letras of Lisbon. Such a schooling ought to be sufficient guarantee that the author will give us here his best thought, sifted and presented according to good method, in a clear and incisive manner; and, in truth, we do find his present work far superior to that of ten years ago from many points of view, but especially in that he shows here a more thorough comprehension of the Middle Ages in relation to the historic periods that preceded and followed them, in his application to the literary life of nations of the striking division of static and dynamic as given by Comte for social phenomena, in his systematic co-ordination of modern literatures, his determination with clear judgment of the relation of Portuguese literature to that of foreign countries, and, finally, his philosophic presentation of the unity of Occidental literatures that thus form a counterpart to the social elements of Western society.

In his introduction the author expounds what he holds to be the basis of literary criticism, and proceeds directly to the discussion of the static elements of literature—race, tradition, language and nationality—and then to the further determination of the dynamic element, defining literature as "uma synthese, o quadro do estado moral de uma nacionalidade; a expressão consciente da sua evolução secular e historica.....Subordinada ao meio social pela sua origem e destino, a litteratura reflecte todas as modificações successivas d' esse meio, achando-se como todos os outros phenomenos sociologicos, sujeita a leis naturaes de ordem statica ou de conservação, e de progresso ou de acção dynamica. Sem o conhecimento dos elementos staticos das lit-

teraturas, é impossivel comprehender a sua origem e modo de formação; sem a apreciação das condições dynamicas, mal se avaliara o que pertence a influencia individual dos escriptores de genio. Pela mutua dependencia entre os phenomenos staticos e dynamicos é que se podem caracterisar as épocas litterarias de esplendor ou de decadencia, de invenção ou de imitação." The characteristics of race, traditions, forms of languages, the sentiment of nationality, are the universal elements of emotion expressed by the writer or by the artist in his works, and hence that only is a chef-d'œuvre, literary or artistic, "que mais assenta sobre bases ethnicas e tradicionaes."

With these fundamental principles constantly in view, our author now moves on to the investigation of the different epochs of Portuguese literature, to a characterization of the writers that have held most closely to popular sources and traditions, from the famous king Diniz, of the thirteenth century; the poets of the *Cancioneiro de Rezende*, in the fifteenth; Gil Vicente, Christovão Falcão and Luiz Camões, in the sixteenth; Rodrigues Lobo and D. Francisco Manuel de Mello, in the seventeenth, down to Almeida Garrett, in the nineteenth century; and he would see in the celebrity of each one only a measure more or less full of his adherence to national tradition. So much the greater will be the poet in proportion as he is able to merge himself into the great current of popular sympathy, into the spirit-life of the people!

Dividing the history of Portuguese literary life into six epochs, the author discusses in the first (twelfth to fourteenth century), which he designates *Trovadores Gallego-Portuguezes*, the influence of Southern France upon home thought and writing: it is the origin and diffusion of Provençal literature and its extension to Portugal; the connection of Northern France, through the *Chanson de Geste*, with the literary production of his native country; the elements of Gallo-Breton thought as represented in her Lays, her Legends of King Lear, of Arthur, of Merlin and Tristan; the ecclesiastic and humanistic influence through Latin translations, and the organization of Chronicles in prose. In the second epoch (the fifteenth century), entitled *Os Poetas Palacianos*,

he seeks to trace the elaboration of Provençal lyricism in Italy, and its passage thence into Spain, and the imitation of the Spanish poetic school in Portugal as represented by the *Cancioneiro geral* of Garcia de Rezende; the spread of the Romance of the Round Table; the diffusion of Latin erudition through translations, and the development of a popular element, as shown in the formation of the *Romanceiros*. The third period (sixteenth century), named *Os Quinhentistas*, represents the high-water mark of literary activity in Portugal: the renascence of Graeco-Roman culture, the conflict between mediæval and classical erudition—the latter represented especially by Italian influence. Here Fernão de Oliveira and Jão de Barros made the beginnings in the discussion of Portuguese grammar, Gil Vicente founded the national theatre, Bernardino Ribeiro and Christovão Falcão developed to its highest point popular lyric poetry, Sá de Miranda and his school, favoring Italian influence, introduced the imitation of classic models, and, finally, came Camões to conciliate and bind together the classical and mediæval spirit in the greatest of modern epics, *Os Lusiadas*. In the fourth period (seventeenth century), *Os Culteranistas*, the author discusses the syncretism of Italian and Spanish influence in Portugal, and the attempted reform in grammar-study of the Portuguese language. In the fifth (eighteenth century), *Os Árcades*, the influence of the pseudoclassicism of the French, the reaction against the humanism of the Jesuits, the reforms of the Marquis of Pombal and the formation of the *Academia real das Sciencias*, with their characteristics and results, are presented in a forcible manner, and the chief causes indicated that produced a transition into the sixth and final epoch (the nineteenth century), *O Romantismo*. Here the renovation of Portuguese literature, as a consequence of the importation of liberal thought; the liberal romanticism, as represented by Almeida Garrett; the religious, by Herculano; the classical reaction of Castilho, and the dissolution of romanticism through the revolutionary and critical spirit of the present time, are set forth with a vigor that enables one to seize readily upon the main lines of literary growth as it exists in

Portugal. In the early part of the treatise, especially, the author is careful to give the sources of literary documents, to indicate where the MSS. are to be found, to present *aperçus* of comparative literary growth that are most encouraging and stimulating to the student of comparative European literatures, and show a striking contrast to the general treatment of this subject by his countrymen. A further important feature of the work is the benefit the reader derives from the author's acquaintance with the recent investigations of English, German, French and Italian scholars in this field. In this respect, the modern school of criticism and the writers on literary history in Portugal give evidence of serious labor that is refreshing when compared with their forerunners of only a few decades ago. In truth, they have fully entered into the quickening spirit of nineteenth-century culture, and nowhere else more than in the noble Lusitania of to-day do we find the liberal thought of European literary life productive of richer fruits and the enthusiasm of the workers marked by a truer sense of their obligation to the glorious past. To be convinced of this, one has but to read this important and timely treatise of one of her most brilliant scholars and most polished writers.

A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT.

Geschichte des französischen Romans im XVII. Jahrhundert, von DR. PHIL. HEINRICH KÖRTING. II. Band: der realistische Roman. XI. 285 pp., 8vo. Oppeln und Leipzig, 1887.

The second volume, containing the third division of Dr. Körting's work (cf. MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES II. p. 38), treats of the Realistic novel. The absence of well-defined separations between the general tendencies of the various authors, as the anti-pastoral, the anti-heroic-gallant, has compelled divisions of the field according to chronology. This obstacle, which could not have been avoided, is mainly responsible for the lack of connected narrative between the succeeding chapters, and gives the impression of a series of monographs rather than of a critical history. In careful research and in arrangement of ma-

terial the same merits appear as in the chapters on the Ideal novel. By the side of the well-known authors—known by name, Dr. Körting would claim, rather than by their works—Sorel, Tristan, Cyrano, Scarron, Furetière, those of less celebrity are discussed, d'Aubigné, Théophile, Lannel, with many of the third rank.

In the case of Mareschal, Dr. Körting makes an appeal from the verdict of time. The *Chrysolite* of this author, which was published in 1627, is given as the first psychological novel in French, and still more as one of the foremost creations of the literature of the century. This latter assertion is, in our opinion, not warranted, from the stand-point of style at least, by the extracts cited in the foot-notes.

Especially interesting is the study of the sources of the French novel in its Italian and Spanish forerunners, leading to a discussion of the characteristics of the various national schools and of the mutual relations which they sustain to one another.

Ample citations are given in foot-notes with particular reference to the manners and customs of the time, and many interesting comparisons are drawn between the satirical novel and the contemporaneous satirical comedy. Certain supposed resemblances to the realistic novel of the present, however, are perhaps open to objection; that Zola selects coarse scenes only as texts for sermons (p. 68) is true only in part, and some might affirm a very small part; and that the finest triumphs of the realistic school are represented in the works of the same author (p. 264) may likewise, on the authority of one of the founders of the school (cf. E. de Goncourt, preface to *Les Frères Zemganno*), be called in question.

The influence of the French novel, both ideal and realistic, on the literature of foreign nations might have furnished, under the pen of Dr. Körting, a most interesting chapter in conclusion. For the English side, the excellent article of M. Jusserand in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of February 15, 1887, gives certain valuable hints in regard to Scarron and Furetière (cf. pp. 611-12).

The value of the whole work appears the more strongly where the obscurer literature of the century is to be traced out and put in its

proper relation to the more celebrated. To one familiar only with the ordinary walks of the seventeenth century literature in France, this history reveals a new and not less attractive side of the national spirit and character.

F. M. WARREN.

Johns Hopkins University.

FRENCH ETYMOLOGY.

Origine et Formation de la Langue Française, Exercices Pratiques de Philologie Comparée. Le Premier Livre des Fables de La Fontaine (Texte de 1668) accompagné d'une version latine interlinéaire calquée sur le texte français par HIPPOLYTE COCHERIS, Inspecteur général de l'Instruction publique. Paris, Librairie Ch. Delagrave.

An interesting addition to the works relating to the study of the origin and formation of the French language is to be found in a pamphlet (80 pp.) used especially in the classes of literature in the French High Schools, the purpose of which is to practically illustrate the derivation of most of the French words from Latin. This the author effects by presenting a text very aptly chosen, *Les Fables de La Fontaine, livre 1er*, with a Latin rendering word for word in such a way that each Latin word is placed directly under the corresponding French word. This, however, would hardly be sufficient: in order to make the derivation plainer and in reality much more true to the facts, this same Latin rendering is, in a third line, represented approximately as it was pronounced or spoken, divested, as it were, of its written dress and given as it sounded in the mouth of the Gallo-Roman soldiers who introduced it into the country. Thus is brought in a striking manner both to the eye and the ear the close relationship which exists between the parent speech and the derived idiom. It is needless to say that the Latin thus set before the student is not exactly the classical Latin, but rather the *lingua rustica*, and the *media et infima latinitas*. Of course, to fully comprehend the scope of the work, reference must be made to the somewhat intricate laws and the philosophical and historical principles that underlie

the science of derivation in the Romance languages.

There are not a few advantages in this novel way of illustrating the derivation of one of the most important of the Romance languages. For instance, the application of the principles is no longer shown merely by examples especially chosen to demonstrate each rule (which is pure theory and, therefore, insufficient), but as they occur in practice almost indiscriminately, so that the student has a chance, so to say, to find them out for himself by a far more profitable study.

It may not be amiss to add that such a philosophical study is required by the English Universities, and even in the Local Examinations of Oxford and Cambridge.

We append one of the fables thus treated. (The French is given in the orthography of the original edition of 1668):

LE LOUP ET L'AGNEAU

La raison du plus fort est toujours la illam rationem de illum plus fortem est totum diurnum illam 'la' ration' de 'lu' plus fort' est tot' djurn' 'la' meilleure;

meliorem
meliore';

Nous l'allons monstrer tout à l'heure.
Nos illum adnamus monstrare totum ad illum horam.
Nos 'lu' adnam's monstrar' tot' a' 'la' hore'.

Un Agneau se desalteroit
Unum Agnellum se (alter)
Un' Agnel' se —

Dans le courant d'une onde pure;
De intus illum currentem de una undam puram;
De int's 'lu' current' de une' unde' pure';

Un Loup survient à jeun qui cherchoit
Unum Lupum supervenit ad jejunum qui circabat
Un' Lup' sup'rven't a' je'un' qui circa'at
avanture,
adventuram,
adventure'

Et que la faim en ces lieux attiroit.
Et quam illam famem in ecce istos locos
Et que' 'la' fam in c̄q'st's loc's —

Qui te rend si hardy de troubler mon breuvage?
Qui te reddit si — de turbulare meum (bibere)?
Qui te red's si — de trub'lar m'um —

Dit cet animal plein de rage:
Dicit ecce istum animale plenum de rabiem,
Dic't 'c̄q' ist' animal' plen' de rabje',

Tu seras chastié de ta temerité
Tu essere habes castigatum de tuam temeritatem.
Tu esser' hab's casti'at' de t'a' temeritat'.

Sire, répond l'Agneau, que Vostre Majesté
Senior, respondit illum Agnellum, quam Vostram Majestatem
Sen'r, respondt 'lu' Agnell', que' Vostre' Majestat'

Ne se mette pas en colere;
Non se mittat passus in cholera;
Nen se mit' pass' in cholere'.

Mais plûtost qu'elle considere,
Magis plus tot cito quam illa consideret
Ma'is plus tot c̄t' que' elle considere'

Que je me vas desalterant
Quam ego me vado (alter)
que' e'o me vad' —

Dans le courant,
De intus illum currentem,
D' int's 'lu' current'.

Plus de vingt pas au-dessous d'Elle;
Plus de viginti passus ad illum de subitus de illura;
Plus de vi'int' pass' a' 'll' de sub't's de elle'.

Et que par consequent en aucune façon,
Et quam per consequentem in aliquem unam factionem,
Et que' per consequent' in al'qu' une' faction',

Je ne puis troubler sa boisson.
Ego non possum turbulare suam (bibere).
E'o nen poss' trub'lar s'a' —

Tu la troubles, reprit cette beste cruelle,
Tu illum turbulas reprendit ecce istam bestiam crudelem,
Tu 'la' trub'les reprendt c̄q' iste' best' cru'ele'.

Et je sçais que de moy tu médis l'an
Et ego sapio quam de me tu minus dixis illum annum
Et e'o sap' que' de me tu min's dix's 'lu' ann'
passé.
passatum,
passat'.

Comment l'aurois-je fait si je
Quomodo inde illum habere habebam ego factum si ego
Quom' ind' 'lu' haber' ha'e'a' e'o fact' si e'o
n'estois pas né?
non stabam passus natum?
nen (e)sta'a' pass' nat'?

Reprit l'Agneau; je tette encor ma
Reprendit illum Agnellum, ego — hanc horam meam
Reprendt 'lu' Agnell', e'o — hanc hore' m'a'
mere.
matrem,
ma're'.

Si ce n'est toy, c'est donc ton frere,
Si ecce hoc non est te, ecce hoc est tunc tuum fratre.
Si 'c̄q' 'o' nen est te, 'c̄q' 'o' est dunc tu'm frare'.

Je n'en ay point. C'est donc
Ego non inde habeo punctum. Ecce hoc est tunc
E'o nen ind' hab' punct'. 'c̄q' 'o' est dunc

quelqu'un des tiens;
qualemque unum de illos (tuum);
qualque un' de 'll's —
Car vous ne m'épargnez guère,
Quare vos non me — —
Quar' vos nen me — —
Vous, vos Bergers et vos Chiens;
Vos, vostros Berbarios et vostros Canes;
Vos, vostr's Berb'c(h)ar's et vostr's Can's;
On me l'a dit: il faut que je me
Homo me illum habet dictum: ille fallit quam ego me
Hom' me 'lu' hab't dict': il' fallt que' e'o me
vange.
vendico.
vend'(h)'.
Là-dessus au fond des forests
Illac de super ad illum fundum de illas (foras)
'la' de sup'r ad 'lu' fund' de 'll's
Le Loup l'emporte; et puis le mange
Illum Lupum illum inde portat, et post illum manducat
'lu' Lup' 'lu' ind' porte, et pos' 'lu' mand'c(h)'
Sans autre forme de procez.
Sine alteram formam de processum.
Sin' alt're' forme', de process'.
A. DE ROUGEMONT.
Chautauqua University.

With the kind consent of Professor de Rougemont, I take the liberty of adding a few critical remarks to his interesting notice.

It is to be regretted that so practical an idea as that embodied in the pamphlet above described should be seriously vitiated—to judge simply from the above extract—by a lack of consistency in its execution and of accurate scholarship on the part of the editor. Numerous examples obviously illustrate the justice of these strictures. It may be worth while to point out some of them:—*toûjours* (l. 1), treated as singular;—*allons* (l. 2), attributed to one of the least probable of its proposed etyma;—*essere* (l. 9): if the pop. Lat. *essere* is given for *esse*, then the form *represtit* should be given for *reprendit* (l. 18);—*pas* (l. 11 and elsewhere) inconsistently referred to Lat. nom. instead of acc. So *elle* (l. 12);—*plûtost* (l. 12), read *plus* *tostum* for *plus tot cito*;—*dessous* (l. 15), read *subtus* for *subitus*;—*cruelle* (l. 18), read **crudel* for *crudelem*;—*mêdis* (l. 19), read *dixisti* for *dixis*;—*comment* (l. 20), read *mente* for *inde*;—*encor* (l. 21), *hanc horam*, improbable etymology;—*donc* (l. 22 and elsewhere), read *donique* for *tunc*; *quelqu'un* (l. 23), read *qua-*

lemquam for *qualemque*; *il* (l. 25), read *illic* for *ille*; *dessus* (l. 26), read *susum* for *super*. Even at its best and when soundly presented, this method of instruction is valuable chiefly for occasional illustration or practice. Its continuous use must very soon result in a wearisome repetition of constantly recurring forms, which will detract from the interest invariably attaching to a more systemate study of French etymology.

H. A. T.

BRIEF MENTION.

The last number of the *American Journal of Philology* contains a characterization of the work of Wilhelm Scherer, from the pen of Professor Waterman Thomas Hewett, of Cornell University.

A new edition of Lessing's Fables, with introduction, notes and vocabulary by E. L. Nastel, has been sent us by the Librairie Hachette & Cie, London, Paris and Boston. While the notes may be said to be fairly well suited to their purpose, it must be confessed that a more meagre and unsatisfactory introduction to a text intended for the use of pupils it would be hard to find. Though the editor was writing for children, he was not thereby exempted from the duty of acquainting himself with the simplest facts of Lessing's life.

The American Dante Society (organized 1880) published, as an Appendix to its Annual Report for 1885, "Additional Notes on the Divine Comedy," by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. These notes were made from time to time during the later years of the poet's life and after the publication of the first edition of his translation in quarto, in 1867. Messrs Houghton, Mifflin and Company (Boston) have embodied the notes in a new edition, just brought out, of Longfellow's Dante, combining the text of the smaller edition of 1870 with the foot-note readings of the original quarto, and thus giving us a definitive edition of a work that has done much for American scholarship. These additional notes are not extensive, but as the author was "fond of reading similarities of thought and expression between Dante and other poets," they are of interest as showing

the range of his reading, and how his mind was running on the "poema sacro" through a long series of years. As the text here given us was revised by Longfellow himself for the edition of 1870, and we have accompanying it a set of his complete notes, it follows naturally that it is the best edition of his translation, and it will doubtless replace the others in a short time. The typography of the work is admirable and, cast into three octavo volumes, the book is handy both for general use and for reference.

We have heard a great deal lately of the so-called "Natural Method" of teaching languages.¹ This method, we are told by its votaries, should and must supersede all others, for the reason that it alone is the true one. In the preface to Deutsch's German Reader, a recent publication of D. C. Heath & Co., we read the following, which is a fair sample of what is claimed for this method. "It is now conceded by most teachers, that in learning any foreign language little is gained by beginning with the study of the grammar, and that the most successful method is the natural one by which a child learns to speak its own language, that is, by constant practice in conversation. A mass of grammatical rules at the outset renders the subject dry and uninteresting, etc."

Now what is conceded is merely this, that to teach any one to speak a language, the learner must be given practice in speaking, and the more the better. Then, with reference to the observation about the learning of grammar, we may remark that the study of language should be interesting, and will be made so in the hands of the good teacher. But even if the pupil should have to learn at times some hard and dry facts, what of that? The effort will benefit him, for he will thus form habits of close application, and acquire a taste for work which will be of great use to him in after years. The charge of difficulty or dryness is not, then, in itself a valid objection to the study of grammar.

But, after all, the real point of dispute is not so much as to the best method of effecting a

given end, but rather as to the end to be accomplished. During the average school or college course, the teacher cannot possibly give his pupils a complete mastery of a foreign language, both in its spoken and written forms. Which then of these disciplines shall he emphasize? The uneducated public regard speaking as the chief thing, but we may ask, of what precise value to the average graduate is the ability to speak a foreign language? The value, if it exist, must be either practical—used in the sense of commercial—or educational. Now, we admit that he who can speak two languages fluently and well has a great advantage in many parts of our land over the man who can speak but one. But can our schools even by the use of conversational methods, impart this ability? We reply, that they cannot, and that, even if they could, life in a German family would effect the same end better and in much less time. To learn to speak a language, one must live for months, or even years, among those speaking it. Conversation for a few minutes on certain days of the week will not suffice, except to give the pupil facility in the use of certain class-room phrases, outside of which he will be helpless.

We conclude, then, that the commercial value of teaching to speak a foreign language in school is very small indeed. What, we ask, is its educational discipline? We reply, that the man who has command of several languages is not necessarily cultured. No one need go far to prove the truth of this. The boy learns by practice to use short-hand, but gains thereby no new ideas. The acquisition, moreover, can be, and is in most cases very speedily lost, leaving the pupil, for whom we have shown it has no educational value, with nothing to show as the fruits of study. I hold, notwithstanding, that language study is very valuable, and that its worth lies not in learning to speak but to read the language. We thereby come to know the intellectual life of another people, and are brought into close contact with the great of other lands and other days; or by a scientific study of the language itself, our intellectual powers are developed and strengthened. Thousands who cannot speak any foreign language are yet immeasurably indebted to their linguistic studies.

¹ Abstract of a paper on *Observations upon Method in the Teaching of Modern Languages*, by PROF. CALVIN THOMAS, of the University of Michigan.

The method, then, in teaching a foreign language in school or college should be thorough and scientific. The pupil must acquire the fundamental facts of the language, and be introduced to its literature. Thus he will have a foundation for further studies. Some colloquial practice is desirable, and to obtain a proper "Sprachgefühl" certain phrases and idioms must be memorized. This work should not be merely imitative, but exercise the intellect of the pupil, and should be treated not as itself the end, but as a means to the true end, which is, literary and linguistic scholarship.

Le Romantisme français, a selection from writers of the French Romantic school, 1824-1848, edited for the use of schools and colleges, by Thomas F. Crane, A. M., Professor of the Romance languages in Cornell University, is a very neat and handy little volume of some 400 pages, published by G. P. Putnam and Sons, New York, 1887. It consists first of a somewhat compressed introduction of twenty-eight pages, treating of the earlier phases of French literature and the rise of the Romantic school. The author has probably said all that could be said in the short space he has allowed himself, but a slightly fuller treatment would have been entirely in keeping with the purpose and character of the book. A "List of works to be consulted" follows, occupying nine pages. This is a useful feature; but is not, of course, intended to be exhaustive. The author has shown wisdom in selecting a bibliography the greater part of which will be at the disposition of the American student in any reasonably well appointed library. The selections are drawn from Victor Hugo, (who supplies two-fifths of the whole), Alfred de Musset, George Sand, Honoré de Balzac, Prosper Mérimée, Théophile Gautier and Sainte-Beuve, and consist of both prose and poetry, chiefly the former. They are well selected as to style and quality, though possibly in some cases selections might have been found more likely to interest the younger student. Some of them, however, are very happy, as tending to show the objects and aims of the Romanticists from within, that is, from their own utterances, notably in the case of some of the extracts

from Victor Hugo and Théophile Gautier. The following sentence (Introduction p. xi.) is liable to cause a misapprehension as to the earliest periods of the Romance literatures: "The French, in common with other peoples of Latin extraction, had during the middle ages a flourishing national literature reaching back to the tenth century and representing every form of composition in prose and verse." A body of notes, not too full, completes a volume which promises to be useful for schools and colleges.

The last number of *Romania* contains, from the pen of Professor J. Stürzinger, of Bryn Mawr College, a detailed notice of the articles bearing on the Romance languages included in Vol. I. of the *Transactions of the Modern Language Association of America*, and also of the Romance contributions to Vol. I. of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES. In *Englische Studien*, X. Band, 2. Heft, appears an article by Professor H. S. White, of Cornell University, entitled 'The Modern Languages in America.'

We would call the attention of those of our readers who are interested in methods, to the clear discrimination and succinct statement of the objects of modern language-teaching as presented by Professor F. V. N. Painter (Roanoke College) in his article: "Methods of teaching Modern Languages," published in the Boston *Journal of Education*, for April 21. Could the purpose for which a language is studied be thus constantly kept in view and no arrogant claims set up for a single system as the panacea of linguistic ills, we should soon reach a stage of pedagogical development in this work that would be the envy of the present mockers at certain methods whose *raison d'être* ought to be confined within strictly defined limits. We need to keep a closer watch over the boundaries of our method territories.

It is a source of great pleasure to be able to announce that the Council of the American Dante Society have made arrangements for the publication of Professor E. A. Fay's *Concordance to the Divina Commedia*, on which he has been steadily at work for the last three

years (cf. *MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES*, Vol. I., p. 14).

The *New Englander and Yale Review* for April, contains an interesting account of the contents of Wilhelm Scherer's library, which was recently bought by the Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. Corresponding to the various interests of Scherer's broad and commanding mind, the library represents not only Germanic philology but also other sciences such as Comparative Philology, History, and Philosophy. It is believed to be one of the finest collections in Germany. The total number of volumes is about 12,000, the price paid being 28,000 marks. While heartily congratulating Adelbert College on its acquisition of such a treasure, we hope that this library may be made accessible to the students of Germanic philology in America, since it is so obviously the wide and proper use of a library, not its mere possession, which renders any collection of books really valuable.

Professor A. Ingraham (New Bedford, Mass.) sends us a few interesting illustrations of what he happily entitles "Yankee Greek." The first is found in Frank R. Stockton's 'Our Story': "She was in a certain way a *floraphobist*, and took an especial delight in finding in foreign countries blossoms which were the same or similar to flowers she was familiar with in New England." A perfect parallel to which is furnished in the Boston *Transcript* of April 11, 1887: "An influential English literary journal asserts that every good book published in England has three readers in the United States to one in England. This is not *Anglophobia*, but owing to American literary discernment," etc.

August Hettler, Publisher (Berlin S. W., 29) has recently brought out *A Historia das Cavalleiros da Mesa Redonda e da Demandado Santo Graall*, an important work belonging to the fifteenth century and the only manipulation of the Graal saga on Iberian territory. The editor, Professor Karl von Reinhardstöttner (Munich), gives us here the text only, according to the Vienna MS. 2594, which is to be followed by a second volume contain-

ing commentary, exegetical material, etc. Price, 7,50 marks.

A new translation of Dante's *Convito* has been announced as in preparation in London by Miss Kate Hilliard, an enthusiastic worker in Dante lore.

Alphonse Daudet's interesting novel, *Numa Roumestan*, has been dramatized and played with great success at the *Gymnase* theatre, Paris.

PERSONAL.

Dr. Francis B. Gummere, of the Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass., expects to pursue studies in Scandinavia during the Summer months. He has just accepted a call to the chair of English in Haverford College, Pa.

Morton W. Easton, Professor of Comparative Philology and Instructor in French, in the University of Pennsylvania (Philada.), was recently appointed Adjunct Professor of Greek in the same institution.

In a letter received just as we were going to press, Professor Storm (Christiania) remarks with reference to his *French Dialogues*: "My book has had an unexpected success here; the first edition has been nearly exhausted in three months, and I am just revising it for the second."

Professor H. Schilling, of Wittenberg College (Ohio), recently delivered a successful course of lectures on the German "Volkslied" and "Shakespeare in Germany" at the Indiana State University (Bloomington), to which he had been invited by the authorities of that University. The lectures on the "Volkslied" were given in German, before one of Professor von Jagemann's classes.

OBITUARY.

FRANCISQUE XAVIER MICHEL, the veteran editor of Old French texts and author of works on subjects antiquarian and literary, died in May, 1887. He was born in 1809 at Lyons, where he began his studies, but for their completion repaired to the Collège Charlemagne

at Paris. After a short period spent in writing for the journals, and in the composition of a couple of historical novels, M. Michel turned his attention almost exclusively to antiquarian researches, and between the years 1830 and 1833 edited several unpublished Old French texts. In 1835 he was commissioned by M. Guizot, at that time Minister of Public Instruction, to make researches respecting French history and literature in the libraries of England, and received in 1837 a similar commission to Scotland. Decorated the following year, M. Michel was called in 1839 to occupy, as *agrégé*, the chair of Foreign Literature in the Faculty of Letters of Bordeaux, and was promoted to a full professorship there in 1846, having obtained his doctor's degree in that year at Paris. A complete list of M. Michel's publications, original and textual, would be beyond the limits of this notice. Many of them were brought out under the auspices of learned societies in France and England. Among his earliest text-editions were the *Chronique de Duguesclin* and the *Chansons de Coucy* (1830), the *Roman de Mahomet* and the *Roman du comte de Poitiers* (1831), the *Lai d'Ignaurès* (1832), the *Lai d'Havelok le Danois* (1833), *Hugues de Lincoln, recueil de ballades anglo-normandes et écossaises* and the *Roman de la Violette* (1834), *Tristan* (1835), *Charlemagne* and the *Bibliothèque anglo-saxonne* (1836), the *Chroniques anglo-normandes* and the *Chroniques des ducs de Normandie* (1836-'44), and many others of a similar nature in later years. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these editions, from the importance of the text thus first brought to the acquaintance of scholars, was that of the 'Song of Roland,' published in 1837 under the title: *La Chanson de Roland ou de Roncevaux, du XII^e siècle, publiée pour la première fois d'après le manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Bodlienne d'Oxford*, par Fr. Michel, Paris, in-8^o. His original works cover a wide range; among them may be mentioned, *Histoire des races maudites de la France et de l'Espagne* (1847), *Etudes de philologie comparée sur l'argot et sur les idiomes analogues en Europe et en Asie* (1856), and *Le Pays Basque, sa population, sa langue, ses mœurs, sa littérature, sa musique* (1857). His edition of the *Roman de la Rose* (Paris, 1864) was merely a reproduction of that of Méon, 1808. M. Michel had also translated into French the works of Sterne and Goldsmith, and a selection from the writings of Shakspere. As late as 1882 he brought out 'A Critical Inquiry into the Scottish Language, with the view of illustrating the rise and progress of civilisation in Scotland.' M. Michel was a corresponding member of the French *Académie des Inscriptions*, and member of the French and British Antiquarian Societies, and of many other learned bodies in England and on the Continent.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

IL PROPUGNATORE ANNO XX. DISPENSA 1 E 2 (GENNAIO, FEBRAIO — MARZO, APRILE). — **Borgognoni** — Davanti alle porte della *Città di Dite*. — **Di Pietro**, Salvatore. Sulla necessità di studiare bene la propria lingua. — **Pagano di Diamante**, Vincenzo. Pietro dalle Vigne in relazione col suo secolo. — **Mola**, Alfonso. Le scritture in volgare dei primi tre secoli della lingua, ricerche nei codici della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli. — **Restori**, Antonio. Osservazioni sul metro, sulle assonanze e sul testo del *Poema del Cid*. — **Simiani**, Carlo, Niccolò Franco. — **Fattori**, Marino. Delle cause che hanno conservata la Repubblica di S. Marino. — **Foffano**, Francesco. La Rotta di Roncisvalle nella letteratura romanzesca italiana del cinque cento. — **Clavarelle**, Enrico. Cariteo e le Sue "Opere Volgari."

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES: 1^{ER} FEVRIER. — **Juscaud**, J. J. Le roman au temps de Shakespeare. [Excellent article on the origins: Lilly, Greene, Sydney and Nash].

15 MARS. — **Ravaission**, F. La philosophie de Pascal. [Writer finds in the 'Pensées' the principles of a true philosophy].

15 AVRIL. — **Levy-Bruehl**. Les idées politiques de Herder.

1^{ER} MAI. — **Brunetière**, F. Sur un buste de Rabelaïs.

LA NOUVELLE REVUE, 15 MARS. — **Baluffe**, A. Le Père de Molière. [Biographical sketch].

15 AVRIL. — **Lacour**, L. Le théâtre de Victor Hugo. Supports the common view that the drama of Hugo is his least durable work.

REVUE CRITIQUE, NO. 6. — **Haym**, R. Herder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken. II. (A. Chuquet).

NO. 8. — **Marc-Monnier**, Histoire de la littérature moderne: I. La Renaissance, II. La Réforme. (Ch. Joret).

NO. 10. — **Schwan**, E. Die altfranzösischen Liederschriften. (Ant. Thomas). — **Scarbo**, Sul dialetto calabro. (Ant. Thomas).

NO. 11. — **Nyrop**, K. Storia dell' epopea francese. (Ant. Thomas). Review of the Italian translation, — **Buhle**, A. d'Aubigné. Histoire Universelle I. (1553-9). (T. de L.). Edition undertaken by the French Historical Society.

NO. 13. — **Geffroy**, Mme. de Maintenon d'après sa correspondance authentique. (T. de L. and G. M.). — **Fleury**, Essai sur le patois normand de la Hague. (X).

NO. 14. — **Grocher**, Grundriss. (Ant. Thomas).

NO. 15. — **Darmesteter**, La Vie des Mots. (V. Henry). — **Bacine**, Les Plaideurs (A. Delbouille). Two new editions favorably commented. — **Boy**, Ch. Oeuvres de Louise Labé. (T. de L.). Foundation for future work.

NO. 16. — **Cadet**, F. L'éducation à Port-Royal (A. Delbouille).

NO. 17. — **Mahrenholtz**, R. Vie et Oeuvres de Voltaire. (Ch. J.). — **Kreiten**, Voltaire. (Ch. J.).

REVUE DU MONDE LATIN. AVRIL.—**Ristori, A.** Etudes et Souvenirs. Médée (of Legouvé).

REVUE POLITIQUE ET LITTERAIRE, NO. 14.—**Faguet, E.** Victor Hugo et ses derniers critiques. (Paul Stapfer and Ernest Dupuy).

NO. 16.—**Drys, P.** La Fontaine de la noix, légende picarde.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUER NEUFRANZOESISCHE SPRACHE UND LITTERATUR. IX.—**I. Schaumberg, K.** Die Farce Pathelin und ihre Nachahmungen.—**Mahrenholtz, R.** Clément de Dijon in seinem Verhältniss zu Voltaire.—**Muench, W.** Die Kunst des Uebersetzens aus dem Französischen.—**Behrens, D.** Grammatische und lexikalische Arbeiten über die lebenden Mundarten der langue d'Oc et der langue d'Oil.

LITERARISCHES CENTRALBLATT, NO. 17.—**Crane,** Italian Popular Tales. (Rho. K8).

NO. 18.—**Schuchardt.** Romanisches und Keltisches.

FRANCO-GALLIA. APRIL.—**Goerlich.** Die nordwestlichen Dialekte der Langue d'Oil.—**Fleury.** Essai sur le patois normand de la Hague.—**Bornhak.** Geschichte der französischen Litteratur. (A. Kressner). Middle Ages lacking and Renaissance and seventeenth century poor.

DEUTSCHE LITTERATURZEITUNG, NO. 6.—**Selbach, L.** Das Streitgedicht in der altprovenzalischen Lyrik. (O. Schultz).

NO. 9.—**Larroumet, G.** La Comédie de Molière. (R. Mahrenholtz). [Excellent study but maintains old view of Madeline Béjart].

NO. 10.—**Moebius, Th.** Kormakssaga. (E. Kölbing). **Thleemann** (Th.), Deutsche Cultur und Litteratur des 18ten Jahrhunderts im Lichte der zeitgenossischen italienischen Kritik. (Max von Waldberg). [Unfavorable].

NO. 11.—**Stern, A.** Die deutsche Nationallitteratur vom Tode Goethe's bis zur Gegenwart. (Minor). [Supplement to Vilmar; poor].—**Elza, K.** Notes on Elizabethan dramatists. III. Series. (G. Sauzer).

NO. 12.—**Cosquin, E.** Contes populaires de Lorraine (H. Varnhagen). [One of the best works on the subject yet published].

NO. 17.—**Antona-Travasi.** Lettere disperse e inedite di Pietro Metastasio. (R. M. Werner).

NO. 18.—**Sallwurk, E.** von, Fénelon und die Litteratur der weltlichen Bildung in Frankreich, etc. (C. Andeae).—**Lehman, E.** Die Altfranzösische Liederhandschriften (F.).

NUOVA ANTOLOGIA. FASCICOLO IV.—**Chiarini, C.** La società inglese al tempo dello Shakespeare. [Affirmation of James' judgement]. Varietà. Canti editi e inediti del popolo recanatese. (Marriage gift by the mother of the poet Leopardi in 1828).

FASCICOLO V.—**Musoginali, F.** Nel Centano del poeta Luigi Uhland.

FASC. 6.—**d'Arcalis, T.** Un attore francese in Italia—Coquelin ainé.

FASC. 7.—**Nunziante, F.** Il Cavalier Marino alla Corte di Luigi XIII.

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU. MAERZ.—**Huebner, E.** Antonio Canovas del Castillo als Schriftsteller.

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. MARCH.—**Pennell, E. R.** Decline and Fall of Dr. Faustus. The legend in English.

APRIL.—**Castellar, E.** The Call of Savonarola.—**Quilter, H.** The decline of the drama.

ANDOVER REVIEW. MARCH.—**Everett, C. C.** The Poems of Emerson.—**Tolman, A. H.** The Laws of Tone-Color in the English Language.

NEW PRINCETON REVIEW. JANUARY AND MARCH.—**Fliske, J. S.** Victor Hugo. [Two articles reviewing the works of the author from an independent point of view].

NATIONAL REVIEW. MARCH.—**Sharp, W.** Rossetti in Prose and Verse.

APRIL.—**Oxenham, H. N.** Mme. de Maintenon.

MAY.—**Hitchman, F.** Lothair and Endymion. Genesis and analysis.—**Paul, F.** A French Critic on Victor Hugo. Agrees with Brunetière.

ROMANIA, OCTOBRE, 1886.—**Bedier, J.** La mort de Tristan et Iseut, d'après le m. fr. 103 de la Bibliothèque nationale comparé au poème allemand d'Eilhart d'Oberg.—**Lutoslawski, W.** Les Folies de Tristan.—**Sudre, L.** Les allusions à la légende de Tristan dans la littérature du moyen âge. La Folie Tristan du ms. de Berne, p. p. H. Morf.—**Soederhjelm, W.** Sur l'identité du Thomas auteur de Tristan et du Thomas auteur de Horn.—**Paris, G.** Note sur les romans relatifs à Tristan.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUER DEUTSCHES ALTERTHUM. VOL. XIX. PART 2.—**Luebke, H.** Die Berliner fassung des puppenspiels vom doctor Faust.—**Schoenach, L.** Urkundliches über die spieleute in Tyrol.—**Schultz, O.** Reinmar v. Hagenau und Auboin de Sezane.—**Baechold, J.** Beiträge zur S. Gallischen litteraturgeschichte.—**Kochendoerffer, K.** Bruchstücke eines gebetbuches.—**Franck, J.** Heiland v. 2.—**Bremer, O. Ahd.ero.**—**Detter, F.** Naharvali.—**Olsen, Waldemar.** Vierzeilige gliederung in Otrfids Evangelienbuch.—**Stosch, J.** Zu Otrfids.

SHAKESPEARIANA. APRIL.—**Henion, Anna E.** Biblical and Religious Allusions in Richard II.—**Vining, E. P.** The Gunther Folio and Autograph.—**Wyman, W. H.** Recent Shakespeare-Bacon Literature.—**Thom, W. Taylor.** A School of Shakespeare; Henry IV, Part I.—Notices of Shakespeare Societies.—The Drama: Verdi and Otello; Shakespeare in Pantomime; Mr. Irving's Reading of Hamlet; Adapting Shakespeare.—**Review: Hugo's William Shakespeare**, transl. by Melville B. Anderson (Appleton Morgan).

MAY.—**McMahan, Anna B.** The Drama and the Stage.—**Rolfe, W. J.** Shakespeare at School.—**Simpson, R.** Henry IV.—**Thom, W. T.** A School of Shakespeare 1 and 2 Henry IV.—Notices of Shakespeare Societies.—The Drama: Modjeska in Twelfth Night.